



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

---

# ***JPRS Report***

# **Soviet Union**

---

***KOMMUNIST***

No 4, March 1988

# Soviet Union

## KOMMUNIST

### No 4, March 1988

JPRS-UKO-88-009

## CONTENTS

9 MAY 1988

[Translation of the Russian-language theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow 18 times per year.]

Communication on the 17 February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum .....	1
Revolutionary Restructuring—Ideology of Renovation [M.S. Gorbachev; pp 5-31] .....	1
On the Restructuring of Secondary and Higher Education and the Party's Tasks in Implementing This Restructuring [Ye.K. Ligachev; pp 32-66] .....	18
Plenum Resolution on Gorbachev Speech .....	40
On the Course of Perestroika in Secondary and Higher Schools and the Party's Tasks for its Implementation .....	41
Energetically Promoting Perestroika [V. Udam; pp 77-84] .....	46
Democratization of the Party Means Democratization of Society; KOMMUNIST Roundtable Meeting by Correspondence .....	52
New Approaches to Solving the Country's Water Problems [B.N. Laskorin and V.A. Tikhonov; pp 90-100] .....	56
My Opinion [L. Kurashov; pp 101-102] .....	64
The Main Problem [A. Onishchenko; pp 102-103] .....	65
Need for Mutual Responsibility [G. Lych; p 103] .....	66
Socialist Revolution and the Individual; Notes of a Historian [V.A. Kozlov; pp 104-114] .....	67
Socialism and Religion .....	73
Pages From the Life and Struggle [L. Yagodovskiy; pp 124-125] .....	79
Pressure From the Right [A. Galkin; pp 126-127] .....	81
Chronicle. Meetings With the Editors .....	83
Publication Data .....	83

## KOMMUNIST

### Communication on the 17 February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum

18020010a Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 3-4

[Text] The regular CPSU Central Committee Plenum began on 17 February 1988. It was opened by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. The plenum debated the item "On the Course of Perestroika of Secondary and Higher Schools and the Party's Tasks for its Implementation." A report on this item was presented by Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary. The following comrades participated in the discussions on the report: V.I. Sitnikov, first secretary of the Irkutsk CPSU Obkom; F.T. Morgun, first secretary of the Poltava Obkom, Ukrainian Communist Party; N.M. Yershova, tuner at the Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod imeni F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Production Association, Perm; V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee; V.T. Saykin, chairman of the executive committee of the Moscow city soviet of people's deputies; V.A. Kopyug, USSR Academy of Sciences vice-president and chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department; K.M. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; K.G. Vayno, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee; G.A. Yagodin, USSR Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education; V.S. Shevchenko, chairman of the presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet; N.A. Nazarbayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, Kazakh SSR; V.G. Kolesnikov, USSR Ministry of Electronics Industry; G.M. Markov, chairman of the board, USSR Writers' Union; Yu.F. Solovyev, first secretary, Leningrad CPSU Obkom; Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary, Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; A.V. Vlasov, USSR Minister of Internal Affairs; D.I. Patiasvili, first secretary, Georgian Communist Party Central Committee; A.A. Logunov, vice-president, USSR Academy of Sciences and rector of the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov; and G.I. Usmanov, first secretary, Tatar CPSU Obkom.

Debates on the report submitted by Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, "On the Course of Perestroika of the Secondary and Higher School and the Party's Tasks on its Implementation," continued at the CPSU Central Committee 18 February 1988 Plenum.

The following comrades participated in the discussions: G.I. Marchuk, president, USSR Academy of Sciences; V.I. Zorkaltsev, first secretary, Tomsk CPSU Obkom; A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy; Ye.M. Chekharin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; K.S. Demirchyan, first secretary, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; S.A. Shalayev, AUCCTU

chairman; Z.I. Borovikova, first secretary, Kurganinskiy CPSU Raykom, Krasnodar Kray; and A.P. Dumachev, chairman, USSR State Committee for Vocational-Technical Education.

M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, delivered a major speech at the plenum. The speech was published in the press.

The plenum passed an expanded decree on the problem under discussion, which was published in the press.

The plenum adopted a decree based on comrade M.S. Gorbachev's address, published in the press.

Organizational problems were considered at the plenum.

The plenum elected comrade Yu.D. Maslyukov candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum elected comrade G.P. Razumovskiy, CPSU Central Committee secretary, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum elected O.D. Baklanov CPSU Central Committee Secretary.

The plenum relieved comrade B.N. Yeltsin from his duties as candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum promoted from candidates to members of the CPSU Central Committee comrades V.I. Boldin, head of the CPSU Central Committee General Department; N.V. Gellert, mechanizer, Sovkhoz imeni Amangeldy, Kazakh SSR; and V.I. Mironenko, Komsomol Central Committee first secretary.

With this the CPSU Central Committee Plenum closed its proceedings.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

### Revolutionary Restructuring—Ideology of Renovation

18020010b Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 5-31

[Speech by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee secretary, delivered at the 18 February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum]

[Text] Comrades:

Our plenum is taking place at a crucial period of restructuring. The democratization of social life and radical economic reform demand a clear action plan from the

party. The Politburo is being guided by this in working out the concept of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. The conference is to determine many aspects of party strategy.

But no matter from what positions we approach defining the ways of developing our economy, culture, and social and spiritual life, the decisive factor will always be man himself, his political and intellectual makeup, his skill, his patriotism and internationalism, his creative ability, his civic stance and activeness.

There is no doubt at all that everything that affects the school education and upbringing is directly bound up with the development of socialism, with restructuring. This is, moreover, the most important area of it. I would remind you that back in the first very difficult postrevolutionary years V.I. Lenin considered the building of the new Soviet school one of the most urgent tasks of the party. That is understandable, since the future of socialism depends, without any exaggeration, on the teaching and education of the new man.

That is how it is today, when our society is carrying out a revolutionary transition to a qualitatively new state. It needs well-educated, committed citizens who are devoted to socialism and at the same time active, inquisitive, able to live and work in conditions of democracy and the economic independence of collectives and in an atmosphere of growing economic and social responsibility for oneself and the country.

The role of all levels of school in preparing such a person was discussed in the report delivered by Comrade Ye.K. Ligachev and in speeches by other comrades, and I will not repeat that.

But if we make such great demands on the school, what a significant and authoritative figure the teacher must be! How extensive his store of knowledge, what a gift for teaching and skill he must possess! Here, comrades, we have the "basic link" of the restructuring of the entire education system.

Of course, a new organization of education, new study programs, and material and technical backup for teaching, including computers, are necessary, and as quickly as possible. But without people who devote their hearts and minds to our children, without the Teacher with a capital T, all this could remain purely formal and costly innovations which do not go to the heart of the matter.

The teacher is the most important protagonist in restructuring. If he supports us with conviction, sense, and passion, restructuring will gain many new sincere champions, fighters, and followers of the revolutionary socialist cause! But supposing he supports us in a purely formal way and remains indifferent and neutral? Who can predict the social stagnation and reversal that such indifference could bring?

Of course, there is always hope in life itself. Today it speaks of the language of restructuring—the honest, frank language of truth and this affords probably the best social training. Yet, and this is only natural, we pin our hope for the future to a considerable extent on the work of our school, its own restructuring, and the teaching talent and creative search of the Soviet teacher.

Our attitude toward the teacher must be radically and resolutely altered, without delay or hesitation. It is necessary to rescue him from petty supervision and eliminate suspicion when he explores and discovers new things. He must be relieved of duties that have nothing to do with teaching and his time and energy must be freed to the maximum for his main task. All obstacles and barriers to innovation in pedagogies must be removed and worthy material conditions for the teacher's creative labor created. This is the duty of party and soviet authorities.

Marvelous innovative teachers seeking their own ways of teaching and instructing children are working in multinational Soviet schools. Their names are well known. The more very highly skilled teachers like these we have and the more often original collectives of like-minded teachers emerge, the more quickly our schools will rid themselves of routine, formalism, and the spirit of stagnation. Our children, grandchildren, and the entire cause of revolutionary restructuring will benefit from this.

The material base of secondary and high schools is another very important area of work. I am thinking here of all kinds of education and training and all educational establishments. Obviously, we will continue everywhere—both at the center and at local level—to seek additional opportunities to develop and strengthen the education base. Here there are not and cannot be two opinions.

Our plenum examined the implementation of the educational reform from broad state positions. The main thing is that we must carry through the reform of secondary and higher education to a conclusion everywhere. We must not permit delays, half-measures, or any lack of coordination. We must act consistently and purposefully.

We have had a very fruitful discussion over the past 2 days. It has shown once again how many problems have accumulated and how doggedly we must work. The overall line here is clear: The Soviet education system must be raised to a qualitatively new level. We are united on that.

But I think it would be wrong now at the plenum to define all the specific routes which the renewal of the educational system will follow. That is a complex task. The broad public and, above all, specialists—teachers, lecturers, and scientists—must air their own decisive opinions in this area. Our plenum's decisions should be a political recommendation from the party to teachers



preparing for their next congress. Workers in higher and secondary specialized education should think about this too. This approach will undoubtedly be in the spirit of democratization and restructuring.

Comrades! I would like to dwell in my speech on some essential ideological aspects of restructuring, namely on the ideological interpretation of the work we are doing, since nothing escapes man's consciousness and nothing is done without man.

I would also like to take this opportunity to ask on a preliminary basis certain questions which must be considered and discussed on the threshold of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Now that we have entered the decisive stage of the struggle to implement the decisions we have adopted, when policy is becoming everyday practice, and when restructuring has gained extensive scope, it is affecting the vital interests of tens of millions of people and all society more and more deeply. Questions which had seemingly already been answered are again becoming topical. People want to gain a better grasp of the essence of the incipient changes in society and to understand the essence and role of the restructuring on which we are embarking, the heights we are striving to reach, and what we mean by the new quality of society which we want to achieve.

This desire is entirely natural: We have started restructuring the forms of social life, assimilating new things, and rejecting existing stereotypes. These changes affect people's consciousness and mentality, their interests, and their position in society and labor collectives. It must be admitted that even many good people seemed in the past to accustom themselves to violations and shortcomings to become indifferent to them, and to lower their social activeness. Many people failed to realize immediately the meaning of the transformations that had begun and did not immediately see that restructuring opens up new goals in life, improves them, and is fully consistent with their material and spiritual interests. Restructuring makes particular demands of those who were not living from their work, who were not following the dictates of their conscience, and who were working badly. I am not just talking about obvious violators of the law and morality of socialist society.

This, I would say, is the complex political and ideological situation in which we will have to operate. The party often has to literally struggle for restructuring both in production and in the spiritual sphere. Needless to say, in our country this struggle does not take the form of class antagonisms. But we can see, comrades, how acute the struggle is. There are fierce discussions about the obstacles which restructuring is encountering; people are worried that the innovative decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January and June 1987 Plenums are being implemented slowly and with difficulty. For the first time in many decades we have a real sense of a

socialist plurality of views. This too is unusual, is assessed in different ways, and requires study, analysis, and explanation. But behind all this we must see the main thing—the people's growing support for the policy of restructuring.

We say that we support and will continue to support anything that benefits socialism, and that we reject and will continue to reject everything that harms the people's interests. We can see that some people are confused, wondering whether we are backsliding from socialist positions, particularly when we introduce new and unaccustomed forms of economic management and social life, and whether we are not revising Marxist-Leninist teaching itself. It is no wonder that "defenders" of Marxism-Leninism have already appeared along with the mourners of socialism, who believe that both Marxism-Leninism and socialism are threatened.

What is the source of this? What is the cause of such fears? The answer lies, I think, in restructuring often being subject to varying interpretations. Some see it as a cosmetic repair, a retouching of the facade, a kind of "fine-tuning" of the existing mechanism which may creak a little but does work, whereas we still do not know how the new version will turn out. Others demand that we strip the socialist system itself to its foundations, declare the path that our people have followed for decades to be false and a dead-end, deny outright the values of socialism, and borrow alternatives [to] them from the arsenal of bourgeois liberalism and nationalism. Others delight in radical phraseology and call for us to skip stages of socialist development, ignoring the logic of restructuring.

I am neither exaggerating nor deliberately exacerbating the problem. Yes, all this is taking place. This situation has been produced by the scale of restructuring, its depth, and the scaling of new heights, when the majority have realized that our goals and plans are realistic and that, to use Lenin's expression, they are "serious and for keeps."

Nor can we fail to take account of the immense difficulties linked with the reorientation of our thinking on fundamental issues. Such a situation has already occurred in our history. Developing his cooperative plan, Lenin pointed out: "...We have been forced to recognize a fundamental change in our entire view of socialism," (" *Poln. Sobr. Soch.*" [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 376). But we know what efforts the party had to make in order to do this. The discussions that took place in those years prove it. It took the prestige and genius of Lenin for the new approach to socialism to gain the support of the party and country. We must learn the lessons of that period well. That is now vitally necessary for us.

Restructuring obliges us to take a new look at certain familiar characteristics and contrast not only the route we have traveled but the route still to come with the

criteria of progress and the goals for building the new society formulated by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. In other words, to verify the direction of our practical actions against the main beacons which have guided communists for more than a century now, and not simply to repeat parroted truisms for the sake of some kind of ritual, but to seek answers to the many issues generated by the prevailing situation.

That, comrades, is why the problems of ideological activity and the questions of the theory of socialism and restructuring are of such great importance. It cannot be said that ideological and theoretical questions have gone unheeded. They are extensively reflected in the Central Committee political report to the 27th Party Congress, the new draft of the CPSU program, the materials of Central Committee Plenums, and a number of other party documents. The very setting of tasks for restructuring in the economy and the political, social, and spiritual spheres of society would be impossible without reliance on theory and ideological substantiation.

In the documents linked with the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution we have tried to make an objective and balanced assessment of the path traveled by the Soviet people and to answer the many complex questions that are concerning the Soviet people. But now—and this should be stressed—there is a persistent feeling that we need to approach these issues with an eye to new demands and to work on them thoroughly.

It is precisely the party—fully armed with a scientific knowledge of the past, the present, and trends that have a real prospect of development—that must head the processes of shaping a socialist consciousness in society. It is precisely the party that can and must theoretically illuminate the new stage of socialist building with an eye to all the innovations that restructuring is bringing to it. It is the party that must select and place at the service of all society anything that really serves socialism, accords with the interests of its development, and advances us toward socialist rather than some kind of alien, "borrowed" goals.

We were led to the need for restructuring, of course, primarily by the desire to resolve the most urgent problems produced by the stagnation of the preceding period. But the more extensively restructuring is disseminated, the more understandable its overall purport and fateful importance for socialism becomes.

The understanding has grown up today that restructuring is an objectively necessary stage in the development of Soviet society, the essence of which is the transition to a qualitatively new condition. We must ensure radical changes in production forces and production relations, the revolutionary renewal of social and political structures, and the growth of society's spiritual and intellectual potential. We are striving, in present-day conditions, to revive the Leninist nature of the new system,

cleanse it of accretions and deformations, and rid ourselves of everything that has fettered society and prevented it from fully realizing the potential of socialism; and, most importantly, to endow socialist society with a new quality in the light of all the realities of the modern world.

The essence of socialism lies in asserting the power of the working people and giving priority to the good of the individual, the working class, and the entire people. Ultimately socialism's task is to put an end to the social alienation of the individual which is characteristic of the exploitative society, alienation from power, from the means of production, from the results of his labor, from spiritual values.

The October Revolution opened the way to the resolution of this historic task. Fundamental steps of crucial significance were the establishment of working people's power, the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, and the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. These are the fundamental gains of socialism.

Throughout the last 70 years our party and people have been inspired by the ideas of socialism and have been building it. But by virtue of both external and internal factors we were unable to realize sufficiently fully the Leninist principles of the new social system. This was seriously hampered by the personality cult, the administrative-decree system of management which grew up in the 30s, bureaucratic, dogmatic, and voluntarist distortions, tyranny, and in the late 70s and early 80s lack of initiative and obstruction phenomena leading to stagnation. These phenomena and what is left of them in our times must recede irreversibly into the past.

That is also the answer to those who express doubt as to whether we are deviating from socialism, from its basic foundations laid by generations of Soviet people. No, we are not deviating by a single step from socialism, from Marxism-Leninism, from everything the people have won and created. But we are resolutely renouncing the dogmatic, bureaucratic, and voluntarist legacy, because it has nothing in common either with Marxism-Leninism or with true socialism.

Creative Marxism-Leninism is the unfailingly objective, profoundly scientific analysis of living, developing reality; a critical analysis, evading nothing, concealing nothing, fearing no truth. Only that kind of analysis works for socialism. There are and can be no restrictions on a truly scientific quest. Questions of theory cannot and should not be resolved by decrees of any kind. A free competition of minds is needed. Our social thinking can only gain from this, its prognostic capacity will be augmented, and that means its ability to serve as a reliable basis for the elaboration of party policy.

Marxism-Leninism is the scientific base for the party approach to the study of social development and the practice of communist building; an approach whose innermost characteristics are the humanism of its objectives, the creative principle, objectivity and honesty in assessing reality, strict exigency toward oneself, and self-criticism. We want to really study and interpret our achievements and the problems that have accumulated, and to learn lessons for our work in the conditions of restructuring and renewal of Soviet society. It is precisely for this reason that we are looking so closely at our Soviet past; this is why questions of history concern us so greatly.

What do we have in mind when we speak of writing an authentic, objective history of the party and Soviet society? This question does not amount solely to naming names, paying tribute to those who were undeservedly forgotten, although that is an important, integral, and, I would say, human part of this vast work. The point is to write a truthful and complete history which will be the history of the people's life and struggle. That is the fundamental question of the Marxist-Leninist methodology of historical research.

If we are to follow this methodology, it is necessary to show graphically how millions of people lived and worked, what they believed in, what combination there was of victories and failures, discoveries and errors, the bright and the tragic, the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses and violations of socialist legality, and sometimes crimes. That will be a scientific, materialist view of history as the result of the activity of the people's masses. It will be a dialectical interpretation of history, rejecting one-sidedness, examining history in all its diversity, complexity and contradiction, without the hypertrophied overemphasis of individual aspects.

The Marxist-Leninist approach to the analysis of society's history presupposes persistent, intensive, and critical mental effort. That takes time, talent and a sense of responsibility. One can understand the public's impatience, the desire to take a look at the closed pages of our past soon. Nonetheless that cannot justify hasty statements or hurried assessments, which can only lead to superficial conclusions that do not reflect the full complexity of the processes that took place. It is impermissible to release to the broad public rush jobs that are more likely to obscure the truth than to illuminate it instead of [really] scientific research. We must guard against this.

The Central Committee and the editorial offices of the mass media receive many letters from people concerned by one-sided, subjectivist assessments of our history that have appeared recently. People write as warmly and passionately about events of half a century ago as they do about today's problems. There is nothing surprising about that. We are talking about something crucial for

us—the attitude toward socialism, the understanding of socialism, how it could happen that alongside the people's heroic achievements, crimes against them were also possible.

What can one say about this question, a question that is difficult for all of us? It is necessary to distinguish between the essential manifestations of socialism and distortions of it, between what arises from objective causes and what is generated by the subjective factor. It is most unfortunate that the conclusive study of our history from this standpoint was not taken to its conclusion immediately after the 20th CPSU Congress. Later people tried to avoid these difficult questions entirely. But there can be no vacuum in ideological life. It was filled either by primitive myths or by totally alien ideology. The main thing today is to create the conditions for tranquil and objective work and to ensure glasnost for this work which, among other things, will promote the active participation of the people themselves in discussing questions of our history, and as promote the people's education and the development of a correct historical awareness in them.

Comrades, I wish to stress yet again that attention to our history is dictated not merely by interest in the past. It is vitally necessary for our work today, for solving the problems of restructuring. We have proclaimed the slogan: "More socialism!"—and we must find out what values and principles should today be considered really socialist.

Socialism has scaled historic new heights of renewal. Consequently everything is being renewed, both [in] theory and practice. Restructuring is both the result of all our preceding socioeconomic and spiritual development, and a kind of phase of "negating the negation," in which we are ridding ourselves of everything that had become an obstruction. Restructuring, if you consider its spiritual dimensions, is a crucial attempt fully to restore in everyone's eyes the enormous significance of socialist values, chief among which is orientation toward the working person. We must scrape off from the values and ideals of socialism the rust of bureaucracy, cleanse them of everything inhuman that people had tried to substitute for them, release people's best creative forces, and ensure the spiritual blossoming of the individual.

Restructuring offers society ideas capable of really uniting and rallying people not by lining them up evenly as if for a parade, but on the basis of the diversity of human potential, aspirations, interests, and capabilities. Restructuring depends on the knowledge, intelligence, and experience of every person, on the best human qualities. It opens up the maximum opportunities for people's education through life, through personal experience of participation in social transformations. It not only opens up these opportunities; it demands that they be utilized to real effect. That is, in fact, the essence of restructuring.



How are things going at present in this main avenue of restructuring? People are learning practical economics, democracy and glasnost, and not merely learning passively, but really participating in the mastery of new methods of economic management. At party meetings, through debates and clashes of opinion in the mass media and practical experience people are coming to understand what restructuring is, what actions it demands from them personally in the specific conditions in which they live and work.

Life itself constantly presents people with a choice. What forms should be chosen in organizing the work of the brigade or shop, the entire collective of the enterprise? How should labor be paid, who should be chosen as leader, who should be entrusted with what? How should relations with associates be organized? What attitude should be adopted to the new phenomena in public life, literature, and art? Or to phenomena which are old, but of which unfamiliar facets are now being illuminated? There are many such questions, and they face people daily. Today the need to choose is stimulating people's activeness and independence, their opinions and actions. Perhaps there is still much here that is contentious and alien. But a sound basis, the just resolution of pressing problems, and a normal daily life consistent with the principles of socialism are having their effect.

The main thing, comrades, is democratization. This is a decisive means of achieving the aims of restructuring. Democratization accords with the very essence of the Leninist concept of socialism. It enables our society to achieve the ideals for which the October Revolution was made. The entire party must have a clear understanding that only through democratization is it possible fully to involve the human factor in the profound transformations of all aspects of social life, in the real processes of management and self-government. Only through democratization and glasnost can an end be put to the deep-rooted apathy and a powerful boost be given to the working people's sociopolitical activeness. Only through the committed and conscious participation of the working people themselves in all social affairs is it possible to achieve socialism's humanist goals.

Today we deeply realize how much we have lost in the past by not fully assimilating—in theory, and even less so in practice—the entire fruitfulness of Lenin's ideas, intentions, and practical recommendations concerning Soviet socialist democracy. This, comrades, should be stressed, because to this day it is possible to come across people who shudder to see the scale of the democratization processes. Some people are nervous, and warn us: Let us hope democracy does not lead to chaos. But take a closer look—what are these people worried about? Not about problems that are of vital importance to society. Rather, they are fussing about their own selfish interests. For party members, of all people, and especially among the leadership, that standpoint is totally unacceptable.

Just as in other matters, the party must set an example of democracy. I am not saying this without reason. We are aware how difficult it is to overcome one of the old, deep-rooted vices—the adherence of party committees and their apparatuses to command methods, to trying to dictate to all and sundry, to make all the decisions. What means do people not resort to! In some party agencies telephone conferences, for instance, are so popular that in some months they hold up [to] as many as 40 of them. They finish one at 11 p.m. and at 8 a.m. they start another. So it goes, day in, day out. What good does it do? Rayon officials have commented with bitter irony that an "obkom-rayon" television link is missing: one cannot actually see the raykom first secretary saluting and clicking his heels.

Numerous attempts persist to contain glasnost and democracy within limits, to take the press in hand, to act without taking public opinion into account. In one place they put pressure on a "troublemaker" for daring to rebel against stagnation, mismanagement and abuses. Elsewhere they try to curtail kolkhoz members' rights. Yet elsewhere they turn elections of a leader into a farce. Somewhere else again—ignoring people's views—they adopt decisions which run counter to people's vital interests and rights. Unquestionably, this is evidence of the habit, formed over many years by a considerable segment of our cadres, of "holding all the reins in their hands," of acting as the highest authority in all matters and using pressure methods. Actually, they do not recognize any other methods. They are really worried by people's growing activeness.

However, we must grasp once and for all that during the new stage of restructuring the party can secure its leading, vanguard role and inspire the masses to carry out deep transformations only by using democratic methods. We have lost and continue to lose a great deal through our inability to fully unleash people's initiative, creativeness, and independence. The biggest, most difficult, and at the same time most important task of restructuring lies precisely in this. Without exaggeration, everything hinges on it today.

No progress is possible without initiative, without creative people. This is all the more true of revolutionary changes. I am saying this because in practice a negative reaction to initiative, a rejection of initiative, can often be encountered. Furthermore, in many cases no effort is made to understand what is being proposed, and pretexts for snubbing the author of an initiative are deliberately sought. This is still quite a widespread phenomenon. We can no longer tolerate such a state of affairs. Otherwise restructuring will fail. We must grasp all this and make every effort to contribute to the development of initiative in society. There are tens of thousands of innovators in our country today, bold people, questing people, people with initiative who are not afraid to break new ground. We must ensure that tomorrow there are hundreds of thousands, and the day after tomorrow millions of them.



Socialism is a society of people with initiative. Indeed, socialism itself is the biggest initiative in history. In short, initiative is not an obstacle, it is not one of life's inconveniences, it is not a campaign; it is a mandatory key precondition of progress.

In the development of the processes of democratization and glasnost a tremendous role belongs to party propaganda and agitation and to the news media. Frankly speaking, comrades, we are still somehow stingy and sometimes more than modest in assessing the results of the great work which is being done by the great army of our propagandists, lecturers, and ideological workers. But it is through their words that the minds and hearts of people are won for the party's ideas, for the ideas of the renewal of society.

I must say that our newspapers, sociopolitical and arts journals, television, radio, lecture propaganda, and direct encounters with production pacesetters, with the "foremen" of restructuring have done and are doing a great deal to create a new atmosphere, to emancipate minds, to awaken interest in all aspects of restructuring, and to amass different opinions.

The press and television train the searchlight of glasnost on those who are deliberately or through thoughtlessness or inability opposing or hampering restructuring. They back the enthusiasts and disseminate their experience, they protect from injustices those who have plunged head-first into working in the new way, who are not afraid to make a mistake, who are willing to take a risk, who feel personally responsible for imparting gathering momentum to restructuring.

I have already spoken at CPSU Central Committee meetings about our positive attitude to this work of the mass media. That does not mean, of course, that everything is all right in this sphere. The news media sometimes lack the skill to reflect the entire complexity and newness of the tasks that are being tackled by the party and the people. From time to time journals and newspapers slip up; unable to resist the temptation of sensationalism, they publish superficial assessments of present and past events, and elements of clickishness can be glimpsed. Despite the fact that the number of reports about the experience of restructuring in labor collectives, cities, rayons, oblasts, republics, and the center has increased, there are clearly still not enough of them. Naturally, the process that is under way is complex and is advancing with difficulty, through questing. However, we will advance the cause of restructuring resolutely and firmly, analyzing its problems, and positive results. The attention of the mass media must be focused on this.

Comrades! The process of democratization has sharply raised the question of the observance of laws in our society. Legal nihilism, which Lenin combated so mercilessly, became quite widespread under the conditions in which command methods were applied. After all, excessive centralism and administration by decree, on

the one hand, and parochialism, on the other, are in general difficult to reconcile with legality. They are more akin to the mentality of Shchedrin's town governor, who spent a long time hatching a draft law "to prevent the constraint of town governors by means of laws."

Restructuring puts up a strong democratic barrier in the way of total license and overzealous administration and forces all authorities and all cadres to constantly check their actions against the law. Many people have not yet gotten used to this, but will have to. We must firmly steer the course toward consolidating the legal levers of restructuring and above all protect the Law on the State Enterprise and other economic reform legislation against being watered down by all kind of departmental instructions and regulations.

The course aimed at further deepening the democratization of society presupposes the consistent strengthening of socialist legality. People's power means the total and undivided triumph of laws which express people's will. Therefore I resolutely back the idea put forward at our plenum proposing that universal basic legal education be organized as an integrated, comprehensive statewide program involving all strata of the population and all our cadres at the center and the at the grass-root levels.

In general, comrades, we ourselves have clearly not yet grasped what far-reaching consequences the processes of democratization are having and will continue to have, or understood the entirely new light in which they raise questions concerning the activities of the party and the state and the life and work of all our country's citizens. Failing to recognize or underestimating the need for the resolute democratization of socialist society is tantamount to showing a lack of faith in the people and their commitment to socialism.

The revolutionary transformations also inevitably deeply affect questions of culture society's spiritual life.

It was gratifying to hear comrades raise this question so broadly and with such interest during the debates yesterday and today. Concern for enhancing the general cultural standards of the people was manifested quite strongly at our plenum. Speakers referred to this in connection with the reallocation of time for the teaching of various school subjects, the need to enhance the quality of secondary and higher education, and the needs of modern technical progress. It was also mentioned in connection with the role which literature, art and artistic creativity in general are now called upon to play, and in connection with the role of culture in everyday life and the implementation of party work. This formulation of the question is correct, because a bold, fearless approach to people and the readiness to discuss and to resolve any problems jointly with them is also a sign of the standard of culture of leaders at any level. Speakers at the plenum have said that there can be no democracy without culture. This is indeed so.

It is particularly important that comrades have linked the problem of culture with relations between nations and the nurturing of a sense of internationalism among the younger generation.

Even at the conception stage and on the eve of Great October it was clearly realized that there could be no socialism without culture or outside of culture. The implementation of Lenin's program of cultural revolution led our society to unprecedented heights of cultural progress and was one of its most important prerequisites.

At the present time, when we are resolving the tasks of the restructuring and renewal of socialist society and the broad development of democracy, problems of spiritual culture are being largely reformulated in a new way. Their new aspect is determined by our present attitude to man and the fact that we are addressing man's real nature, potential, and needs: After all, man does not live by bread—or even by modern material wealth—alone. More than anything else he lives by truth and conscience, justice and freedom, morality and humanity. The contemporary stage of the development of socialism also poses the problems of culture in a new way: It is already clear today that socialism's renewal revives the attractive force of socialist values all over the world, cleansing them of the destructive consequences of stagnation, complacency, and spiritual immobility. They are also posed in a new fashion by the contemporary world—a world of unprecedented intensity of contacts, interactions and exchanges in science, culture and information; a world of daily and sharp clashes and confrontation, but also a world of mutual enrichment through progressive universal values.

According to the old adage, a new cultural stratum builds up only on well tilled soil. Marxism itself emerged along the high road of world culture. Bolshevism incorporated the progressive humanist traditions of Russia's great culture. The wealth and inhumanity of the "old" culture—and we all know how highly it was valued by V.I. Lenin—constituted a major contribution to world civilization. It was on this culture that people who headed our revolution were brought up. Now as well we must boldly and energetically augment and expand the cultural stratum of restructuring, utilizing and developing all the spiritual wealth created by our predecessors.

In other words, Lenin's formulation of the task remains as important as ever: to enrich ourselves "through knowledge of the culture created throughout mankind's development." (op cit., vol 41, p 304). This is a manifestation of the dialectics of class and universal factors in today's specific conditions.

One of the main lessons we must learn from the past is the following: Since we are resolutely rejecting administrative edict methods in the economy, these methods are even less acceptable in the society's spiritual progress. Democracy, trust in people, tolerance of the unusual and

the exploratory, competence, benevolence, encouragement for initiative and innovation, support for talent—these are the key principles of party work in cultural matters, in the spiritual sphere of restructuring.

The party has firmly charted the course of adopting a concerned, competent, and far-sighted attitude to the processes now under way in our society's spiritual sphere, which are helping it to cleanse and enrich itself and to develop its moral strength and creative potential.

We are not talking about letting processes in this area just drift along, or about tolerating phenomena which are incompatible with our ideology and morals. Such a formulation of the question is unacceptable to us. The interests of the people, the interests of socialism—these are the guidelines of restructuring, including restructuring in the spiritual sphere.

The tasks of restructuring must be solved in such a way as to ensure the maximum possible incentive for people's initiative and independence and to overcome their passiveness, civic indifference, apathy, and lack of independent thinking, all of which are defects directly attributable to the bureaucratic style of leadership. It must be realized that obstructing forces also exist in the spiritual sphere. Here they may even be more powerful than anywhere else.

Yes, some people do find it easier, simpler and more customary to live by inertia. There are also people whose expectations are inordinately high, who would like to achieve changes at one fell swoop. But there are no miracles to be had. Our tasks are immense and complex. Restructuring means work, more work, and even more work; dogged, courageous, daily work. To realize this and to become imbued with responsibility for the success of restructuring means to take a step forward in spiritual development. The Soviet people and the Soviet intelligentsia, realizing this, are confirming their responsiveness and their support for the party goals by practical deeds.

We are aware of and value the intelligentsia's contribution to restructuring, to the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, to the ideological and theoretical interpretation of our times, to the development of the country's social awareness, and to the artistic depiction of Soviet people's entire wealth of intentions, feelings, aspirations, and thoughts. I am confident that we will read, see and hear works befitting our tempestuous time.

A unique feature of our culture is its multinational nature. We are used to talking about it often, but it does seem that we have not yet fully learned to value it. The peoples of the USSR are linked by a common historical fate. This is the foundation of our fraternity and kinship, which have withstood the most grueling trials. Our strength has its source in the free development of national cultures, enriched through the spiritual experience of fraternal peoples and all mankind.

True internationalism and true friendship among peoples are possible only under conditions of profound respect for the dignity, honor, culture, language and history of every people and broad contacts among them. We must assist by all means the further expansion of contacts among national cultures, their reciprocal enrichment, their flowering and upsurge.

Soviet patriotism is our greatest asset. Any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism are incompatible with it. Nationalism, whatever form it may take, is blind. Attempts at self-isolation only lead to a spiritual dead-end. The root system of Soviet patriotism draws nourishment from knowledge and awareness of the scale, grandeur and the specifically human component of the socialist revolution, of the complete truth and heroism of the party's and the people's struggle for socialism and in defense of the socialist fatherland. At this point we approach a very important question—the unification, through revolution and Soviet power, of every people's national pride and national gains with the internationalism of socialist society.

To put it briefly, at the present stage we must get down to some very substantive work on nationalities policy, along all avenues, both in theory and in practice. This is a most fundamental and most vital question facing our society. I think that we ought to devote a Central Committee Plenum to the problems of nationalities policy.

I would like to join those comrades who, addressing the plenum, also spoke about the intolerability of any subservience in cultural and ideological matters. Our actions in the cultural sphere—and maybe precisely there in the first place—must be guided by our Marxist-Leninist principles. Principles, comrades, must not be compromised on any pretext. According to Lenin, a principled policy is the most correct policy.

Comrades! The radical economic reform has presented us with many new problems, some of them ideological, demanding study and solution. Today we can say that this reform is spreading widely and encompassing virtually all spheres of the national economy. Mass assimilation of new methods of planning, self-financing, self-governing and wages is under way. Management is being restructured. Another new feature of the economic situation is the fact that cooperatives and individual labor activity are gathering strength in various sectors. Essentially, the shaping of the socialist economy's cooperative sector is taking place on a new basis.

All this introduces substantial changes in the principles of administration and economic management, as well as in the organization of the entire system of economic relations. Now we can no longer rely on state philanthropy, so to speak. People must rely primarily on their own strength, on the quest for more efficient economic solutions, on the broad introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, on high standards of

cadres' skills and competence and of working people's initiative. We, comrades, are witnessing the way people's attitude to work is changing. They are becoming increasingly aware of the value of labor and material resources and are coming to realize that high-end results cannot be achieved without thrifty and efficient utilization of these resources. People are beginning to realize that today they cannot cope with the new tasks using the old approaches and the old attitudes to the performance of their obligations.

Of course, we are still merely embarking on the introduction of cost accounting. The system will be improved. There will be a switch to wholesale trading in means of production, the development of direct links and cooperative forms of activity, and a pricing reform. We will all have to do this to assimilate and consolidate it. But the introduction of cost accounting, even in its present form, has already given rise and is giving rise to a number of problems, encountering obstacles, and revealing various aspects of the inhibiting mechanism which have not yet been completely eliminated.

We have elucidated the basic reform issues and elaborated, discussed nationwide, and adopted the Law on the State Enterprise. Now it is necessary to act without the slightest deviation from its stipulations. But in practice we are still encountering the fact that both in the center and at the local level people are frequently operating in the old way and are trying to drag the national economy along by the old methods.

In the center people are still clinging tenaciously to gross output indicators, state orders reveal administrative meddling, and efforts are being made to turn economic methods of management into veiled forms of command management. In some cases targets are issued in contravention of the Law on the State Enterprise, ignoring the opinion of labor collectives and without due account of resources and production capacities.

At the enterprise level, many were found unprepared for work under conditions of cost accounting. Inadequate use is being made of the great opportunities and extensive rights, and many economic cadres are biding their time, waiting for something to happen, and being slow to join in the work on mastering the new management methods. Devotion to the old ways is so strong that even when there is an opportunity to obtain greater revenue by increasing the output of products that are in demand they do not do it, preferring a quiet life to greater material prosperity. Perhaps this is explained by the fact that in a number of cases all is not well with economic standards. Nevertheless the main factors are the prevailing mentality, the policy of playing safe, and, at times, incompetence.

Of course, comrades, all such phenomena are, to some extent, understandable. After all, the real process of the conversion of enterprises to cost accounting has only just begun. It is understandable, but clearly it is necessary to



give a timely warning that unless we overcome such sentiments and radically change attitudes toward the new methods of management things will go wrong.

The development of the cooperative movement, individual labor activity, and collective, family, and other contracting methods have also created many problems. Because not everything is running smoothly in this major task, there have been abuses, and here and there questions have been raised about the legality of such forms of management. In some cases this important socioeconomic process is being artificially restrained.

What should one say here? We must gather experience in a quiet and businesslike way, banishing speculative tendencies and using above all economic, taxation methods and, finally, glasnost. The only principle is the socialist principle: Cooperative and personal income must be earned income and be determined, as it is everywhere, by the quantity and quality of labor.

Considerable changes are also taking place in the improvement of the organizational structures of management. They are entirely opportune and necessary, because they are geared to overcoming a legacy of administrative command methods of economic management. But here too the old approaches are not surrendering without a fight at oblast, republic, and union level.

All this, comrades, gives rise to a complex situation, causes passions to seethe, intensifies the battle of opinions and, frankly, creates tension in production relations and in the ideological sphere. Some people have fully accepted the changes that are taking place, are moving ahead confidently along the path of new management methods and reliance on people's initiative and enterprise, and are making their own creative contribution to the reform. Others appear not to want to be out of the general movement, but all they do is—to put it mildly—imitate and confine themselves to half-measures, which cannot be justified in any circumstances. Of course, it must be borne in mind that there are people who are essentially against reform, who are sabotaging the introduction of economic methods of managements, and are doing their utmost to discredit them, using as a cover references to objective causes and even to the opinion of working people.

What can one say in this connection? We have set the implementation of radical economic reform as a major political task. The country's attainment of the heights of socioeconomic progress depends on its success. There simply cannot be any retreat from it. In fact, there is nowhere to retreat. Everyone must act vigorously and purposefully. We must not get bogged down half-way or somewhere at the start. We must go forward. It is on this basis that one should also assess the positions of all departments and party, soviet and economic bodies, and if you like, the positions of labor collectives.

I would like to formulate this question in broader terms. After all, economic reform is an integral aspect of the transformation and renewal of socialism as a social system giving it more modern and more dynamic forms. It must create the necessary prerequisites and powerful stimuli for scientific and technical progress, combine the potential of the planned economy with people's personal interests, initiative, and enterprise, and give public ownership and management methods forms whereby people feel that they are really in charge of production.

Scientific analysis and, indeed, practical experience have led us to firmly believe that all these tasks, essentially interrelated and forming a single entity, can be successfully solved by converting enterprises to the principles of cost accounting, self-capitalization, self-financing and self-management. This is the way to harmonize the interests of society, the collective, and the individual, which guarantees the satisfaction of social needs and at the same time ensures commitment to the end results of production on the part of working people themselves. This is the way to eradicate the equalization and the parasitism which have done so much damage in the past. This is the way to solve social problems as quickly as possible, which again directly affects the individual and entire collectives and helps strengthen discipline and increase efficiency. This is a realistic economic basis for deepening democracy, for working people's involvement in management, and for overcoming people's alienation from the economic process and its results.

At the stage of the extensive unfolding of the economic reform the question of social justice has become even more acute. You would think the problem was sufficiently clear—it is necessary to consistently follow the path of strict observance of the chief principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his labor." That is true. But in practice, and—it has to be said—in our ideas as well, we have far from shrugged off the mentality of equalization.

It is really no secret that many people are still getting paid just for turning up at work and hold jobs without their actual labor contribution being taken into account. The most surprising thing is that not many people are bothered about this. But as soon as people in cost accounting collectives get a pay raise because of an increase in the end work results, there are immediate protests and expressions of annoyance: They are getting too much, they say. But under socialism the question can only be formulated as follows: Not "much" or "little," but "earned" or "not earned." There is also the point that the assessment of quantity and quality of labor must rest on scientifically substantiated criteria that have been proved in practice.

In general, comrades, we must really get down to tackling the problem of eradicating wage-equalization approaches. This is an extremely important socioeconomic and ideological problem. Basically, wage-equalization has a destructive impact not only on the economy



but also on people's morality and their entire way of thinking and acting. It diminishes the prestige of conscientious, creative labor, weakens discipline, destroys interest in improving skills, and is detrimental to the competitive spirit at work. We must say bluntly that it is a reflection of petit-bourgeois views which have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism or scientific socialism. We shall not be able to progress further and cope with the tasks of restructuring if we do not completely eradicate wage-equalization views wherever they still persist.

Yes, socialism is a society of social guarantees which does not leave a person to face life's difficulties and adversities on his own. Soviet people's social protection is based on the elimination of private ownership and exploitation and on the power of the working people. The principle of social protection is codified in our laws and underpinned by many years of practical application. The most important social guarantees have been created in our country—the right to housing, guaranteed employment, and free education and medical treatment.

Despite all the shortcomings and deficiencies that exist here, the fundamental significance of these achievements is unquestionable. However, the standard of social protection in our society depends on the size of the national wealth which, in turn, depends on the accurate and consistent application of the socialist principle "from each according to his abilities; to each according to his labor." In line with this principle, a person's well-being and living conditions are directly dependent on the application of his abilities and talent and his contribution to the common cause. This is the foundation of socialism's vitality. It depends on the talent and specific contribution of every working person to the country's social wealth. At the same time, we must put a decisive stop to any self-seeking impulses wherever they may become apparent. Only honest and conscientious labor within the bounds of our laws and current regulations is owed high material recompense and public recognition.

Comrades! We have great plans for the development of the economy. They are well-known to you. But while putting all our effort into developing this large-scale work, we must not lose touch with the people's everyday needs and requirements.

Let me remind you that we started perestroika itself under pressure from urgent, vitally important problems. More than once I have had to return to an assessment of the situation which existed in our country at the beginning of the 1980s. I would like to add a few more considerations. As you well know, the pace of economic development in our country had dropped to a critical point. But even the pace we had reached, as has since become clear, had been achieved to a considerable extent on an unhealthy basis, on the basis of short-term factors. I am thinking of our trade in petroleum on the world market at the high prices which existed at that time and also the totally unjustified accelerated sale of alcoholic

beverages. If we purge economic growth indicators of the influence of these factors, it turns out that, basically, for four 5-year periods there was no increase in the absolute growth of the national income and, at the beginning of the 1980s, it had even begun to decline. This is the real picture, comrades! Only now is the economy beginning to grow on a healthy basis.

We continue to feel strongly the consequences of the situation which had developed in the past. Now, when the world market situation has changed and the price of fuel and energy resources has dropped and when, for the sake of preserving the population's social health we have been forced to reduce the production and sale of wines and spirits, the country's economy has come up against a very serious financial problem. As a result of reducing the sale of alcohol, in the last 3 years the state has suffered a shortfall of more than 37 billion rubles. In addition to this, compared to 1985, revenue in 1987 from the sale of imported goods, the purchase of which we have been forced to limit due to a shortage of hard currency, fell by 9 billion rubles.

The situation which has developed demands enormous, I would say extraordinary, efforts by us in two simultaneous directions: in the implementation of the radical economic reform and in improving the current economic situation and meeting our people's vital needs.

As you will remember, we singled out at the June 1987 Central Committee Plenum the priority problems from an entire range of issues: food, housing, and essential goods and services for the population. How are our decisions being backed up by real actions on a national scale and at republic, kray, and oblast levels? The party has to know this, comrades, and so must the people.

First, the food situation. In the first 2 years of the 12th 5-five year period the gross grain harvest increased by 17 percent. Compared to the average annual output for the 11th 5-year period, meat production has increased by 2.1 million tons, or 13 percent; milk production by 8.2 million tons, or 9 percent; and eggs by 7 billion, or 9.4 percent. There has been an increase, as you can see. It has ensured a certain improvement in the food supply situation. This has been achieved despite reduction in the import of such products as a result of loss in hard currency revenue. Nonetheless, the situation with food resources does not satisfy us and we must work persistently to increase stocks. Great opportunities exist in this area, but they are used in diverse ways.

On the one hand, in a number of republics and oblasts there has been an appreciable increase in agricultural output in recent years. For example, until quite recently agriculture in Orel Oblast was seriously lagging behind in its development. But there have been improvements recently. Farms in the oblast have devoted a great deal of attention to the use of efficient forms of labor organization and remuneration. Various types of contracts are

being applied virtually throughout the crop-growing sector: The collective, lease, family, and individual contracts. The conversion to the contracting principle in livestock breeding is drawing to a close. Greater attention is now being paid to the social development of rural areas. Last year laggard farms in the oblast commissioned an average of 50-100 apartments, 40 additional places in schools, and 43 additional places in children's preschool institutions. This has improved the cadre situation in rural areas and set prerequisites for improving productivity in crop farming and livestock breeding. As a result, in 1986-1987 gross agricultural output increased, compared to the average annual level for the previous 5-year period by 18 percent and labor productivity by 27 percent. Thanks to above-plan production, in the last 2 years local meat sales increased by 33 percent and sales of dairy products by 17 percent. The people can really feel the effects of the restructuring process under way.

Unfortunately, by no means is such work being done everywhere. Field and livestock unit productivity and farm economic efficiency remain low in Armenia and in Novosibirsk, Voronezh, Yaroslavl, Kirovograd, Kostroma, and Rostov Oblasts. Owing to lagging in dairy farming, people there did not even meet planned deliveries of milk for local use. The same happened in Azerbaijan, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Chechen-Ingushetia, and Odessa and Chardzhou Oblasts in terms of meat supplies.

In order to change the situation, we must firmly overcome freeloading and the desire of many local leading cadres to solve questions of the food supply by submitting ever more requests to the center. What is the essential feature here? We must end bureaucratic management and ordering about kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is important to provide broad scope for resourceful and enterprising activity by working people in the agrarian sector and make active use of all efficient forms of labor organization and pay, such as collective, leasing, and family contracts within kolkhozes and sovkhozes, as well as new approaches within the RAPO framework.

On housing construction and some questions of social development: As you know, measures have been adopted and are being implemented for solving problems in this area faster. The first results of the work are as follows: In 1987 approximately 130 million square meters of housing was constructed using all sources of financing, or almost 2.5 million square meters more than planned and 10 million square meters above the 1986 results, or more than was accomplished in any previous year. Last year alone 18 percent more premises were completed for general education schools, 7 percent for preschool establishments, 61 percent for vocational and technical schools, 17 percent for medical centers, and 36 percent for clubs and culture centers.

I have already spoken about successes in housing construction in the Kazakh SSR. Kazakh construction workers worked well last year. They fulfilled their annual

program by the 70th anniversary of Great October Revolution. As a result, one out of five families waiting their turn received an apartment. Such successes make the prospect of solving the new problem realistic, that of providing housing by 1991 for all the republic's working people who had registered by the beginning of 1987.

In Estonia social development efforts are being made in all areas. The plans are being fulfilled there on a stable basis year after year, and the highest housing availability in the country has been achieved, to a large extent through the skillful use of the population's funds. Another important problem is being solved systematically—that of having a school, a nursery-kindergarten, a club, and a cafeteria on every farm in the countryside, modern and well-built. I particularly wish to emphasize that the Estonian construction worker's successes are based on the priority development of their own material and technical base.

At the Central Committee June Plenum, as you will remember, the leaders of many republics and oblasts were criticized for falling behind in housing construction. This is still taking place. Housing and social construction remains sluggish in Tajikistan and in a number of areas in the RSFSR, Gorkiy, Novosibirsk, Penza, Ryazan, and Chita Oblasts and Dagestan in particular.

What is happening? What are the main reasons for lagging? If you bear in mind that the starting conditions are practically identical for everyone, the answer to this question must be sought, first of all, in relapses into an old disease—discrepancy between talk and action. Good programs are being drawn up everywhere but far from everywhere is their implementation backed up by the necessary organizational and economic efforts.

The Central Committee Politburo recently examined and approved the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on developing individual housing construction in cities and rural localities. The outlined measures eliminate the unjustified restrictions which existed in the past and create favorable conditions for providing credit and constructing individual housing. All this should substantially help in the implementation of our social programs. The local authorities must pay proper attention to individual builders and give them the necessary assistance.

In general, comrades, comprehensive steps are being taken, as you see, and they must be applied more actively today in order to resolve the housing problem more quickly and to create better living conditions for the Soviet people. Let us be uncompromising in our assessments, comrades: Nonfulfillment of housing and socio-cultural construction plans is unforgivable and totally unjustifiable. Instances of failure to meet targets must be publicized everywhere, and those guilty of wrecking an important social program must be made answerable to the working people.

The state of affairs relative to the production of goods and to services to the population arouses serious concern. Measures to accelerate the development of consumer goods production are yielding certain results. Over the past 2 years production of industrial consumer goods increased by 16.5 billion rubles, or 9.4 percent, including 3.3 billion rubles or 4 percent in light industry. Yet the situation in the consumer market remains strained, and the population's solvent demand is not being satisfied. Last year industry produced consumer goods worth 3.6 billion rubles less than envisaged in the plan. Enterprises of union ministries accounted for a large part of the shortfall, particularly products made to modern technical standards in greater demand. There were hardly any tangible changes for the better in the quality of consumer goods. The material and technical base for expanding services to the population is being developed particularly slowly.

Without relieving sectorial ministries of responsibility, the radical restructuring of the country's economic management is shifting the center of gravity of practical work to satisfying people's needs for goods and services and ensuring a balance between the population's income and expenditure precisely into the republics, krays, and oblasts. Attempts to avoid participation in solving these vitally important problems for whatever reason must receive a sharp assessment.

Obviously, we must also give thought to the following question: How perfect is the economic mechanism we have adopted for encouraging labor collectives and sectors to increase consumer goods production? Especially since the attempts to resolve the problem of the quantity and quality of goods and services by methods of bureaucratic administration alone have had little effect so far. We have no reason to be afraid to acknowledge the blunders that have been made here. On the contrary, the faster they are noted and rectified, the better and more quickly we will secure results. The one permanent requirement is the following: Problems must be solved quickly and not "shelved."

Perhaps, having listened to this part of the speech, some of you will be wondering: But what bearing does this, in fact, have on the ideological aspects of restructuring? I believe that there is a direct link here—the way our people feel, their consciousness, their mood, and their attitude to work, to party policy and to restructuring largely depend on how these problems are solved.

Comrades! Our economic reform, the development of the processes of democratization and glasnost, the renewal of the spiritual and moral sphere, that is, everything we associate with the concept of revolutionary restructuring are links in a single chain. They are closely interconnected and interdependent and demand that, having begun restructuring in one of them, we follow it in another.

So we have now approached quite naturally and, I would say, logically the need to restructure our political system. Of course, it is not a question of replacing the existing system but of introducing qualitatively new structures and elements into it and imparting to it new substance and dynamism which will ensure our society's successful development. These questions are already being discussed widely and actively in the country. This is no coincidence. Restructuring runs deep. It must embrace all spheres and, of course, the very important sphere of the political system of society.

As I have already said, we still have substantial work to do on these questions before the 19th Party Conference. The main problem of the development of our political system is the creation of the kind of mechanism of authority and management which would clearly establish effective democratic control and formulate the appropriate legal procedures which would substantially reduce and even eliminate the element of chance in the solution of the most important political and state questions and exclude the possibility of subjectivism at all "levels" of our political system. It is necessary to ensure that principled decisions are formulated and adopted with the active involvement of the people. This will also promote our socialist democracy.

Above all what we must discuss here is radically enhancing the role of the soviets as the pivot of our society's political system and its embodiment as a state. It is precisely here, in the formation and functioning of the soviets, that socialism's democratic principles are to be implemented first and foremost. In a certain sense we speak today about the need to revive the power of the soviets as Lenin understood it. Soviets at all levels must be really working, resourceful, and full-powered centers of state power and administration.

This clearly means that we must think better about the way in which soviets are formed. This implies the need to improve our electoral system so that the process of forming the authorities would ensure the active participation of the people and the careful selection of people capable of supporting the soviet's activity in the light of the tasks of restructuring. Soviets must take account of the full diversity of our country, including its national characteristics. Of course, we must not overlook the USSR Supreme Soviet's activity. Its role must be considered anew with regard to intensifying work efficiency, from the Presidium and its sessions to the activities of commissions and deputies.

Demarcating the functions of party and state authorities is a fundamental question of political reform. Here, too, Lenin's ideas must be the basis. The party's directing and leading role is the essential condition for the functioning and development of socialist society. The party is responsible for the theoretical development and adjustment of the political course. It conveys its policy to the masses, organizes and unites them to implement the set tasks, and pursues appropriate cadre policy. Properly



speaking, these are the basic functions of the party as society's political vanguard. In today's restructuring and democratization, Lenin's teaching on the party and its activity under socialism must be fully revived. We must take well thought out and collectively elaborated proposals on these questions to the All-Union Conference.

It is impossible to conceive the political system that is being created without a developed system of social organizations or a fundamental change in the content and methods of their work. It must be based on the understanding that each social organization is backed by certain social strata with their own specific features and interests. The task is not to reduce them all to the same level but on the contrary to highlight them as much as possible, take them into account, and place them at the service of social progress. The main task of social organizations is to develop sociopolitical activeness, to satisfy diverse interests, and to give citizens social self-governing skills.

I believe that we must make it our aim in social organizations to eliminate the domination of paid functionaries, overorganization, and bureaucracy by transferring part of the powers of central authorities to lower levels, and to free organizations at lower levels from the need to check every step with their superiors.

There is a perceptible need to develop a system of social structures and set up a number of social organizations which unite people on the basis of various social, professional, and other interests. Clearly it is necessary to broaden the range of questions which state agencies can resolve but only with the participation of social organizations.

Socialist democracy means a diversity of forms of social and political life based, naturally, on our socialist principles and values. The decisions which, in our view, the party conference ought to take should be based on that idea.

This also applies to questions of national relations and national-state building. We speak today about the growth in national self-awareness of all the country's nations and ethnic groups and about manifestations of national sentiments (at times manifested in a deformed state). These are live questions which must be resolved. Thought must also be given to the forms of the further development of ties between republics and the strengthening of their rights, including in terms of their representation in the central state agencies.

As you can see, many problems have built up. There can be no half measures here. Clearly we face a task of preparing for the upcoming party conference detailed proposals on improvements in the political system, based on the ideas of the 27th Party Congress and Central Committee plenums on the socialist self-government by the people and take into account the democratization processes taking place in society.

Now, comrades, as to some international aspects of the ideology of restructuring.

Having endured and interpreted with our hearts and minds the experience and lessons of the past we have set ourselves the task of understanding, studying and understanding the society in which we live. We have posed the question in the international arena in precisely the same terms: To understand, investigate, and study the world in which our country lives. An objective analysis made us realize the need for restructuring and for a new political thinking. Thereby a breakthrough was achieved in the scientific understanding of present-day realities, which turned into an innovative and dynamic policy.

Even before the party congress, in the 15 January 1986 statement, we announced a program for advancing toward a world without nuclear weapons as an indispensable condition for mankind's survival. The 27th CPSU Congress provided a detailed interpretation of the philosophy of peaceful coexistence as we move from the old to the new century and validated the concept of an all-embracing system of peace and international security. Our initiatives in the disarmament sphere and other concrete steps taken in the international arena are now no longer improvisations, not simply a reaction to some Western political moves and actions as was frequently the case in the past. They were given a firm, long-term scientific basis.

Thus the path was laid to Geneva, then to Reykjavik, and finally to Washington for the signing with the United States at the summit the first nuclear weapons reduction agreement ever—the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. I believe that when assessing its significance we all agree that it really does confirm the correctness of the policy initiated at the April 1985 Plenum and validated in theoretical and political terms at the 27th Congress. We say that the treaty signed in Washington marks the beginning of real disarmament. We want it to be that way, and we will work to ensure that it be followed.

But this is also the result of the efforts of the struggle waged by the socialist countries, other progressive and peace-loving states, mass social movements, the United Nations, and the Nonaligned Movement against the nuclear threat. It is the result of the activity, strengthening and mutual understanding among outstanding scientists, cultural figures, clergymen, etc. It is also the consequence of the sensible and effective stance taken by many politicians, representatives of the business world, and military circles.

In its way the treaty indicates the potential for peace that has now been attained. It also demonstrates that the new thinking is not only capturing people's minds but has already begun to influence world policy. The drafting of



the treaty provides instructive experience. It showed the fruitfulness of equal if difficult and strenuous talks in which mutual interests and concerns were scrupulously taken into account.

However, the signing of the treaty is not a pretext for complacency or smugness. We can say that it has opened up another stage in the struggle for disarmament and peace, which indicates another stage in the ideological struggle. Very soon, past the first few days of euphoria, the enemies of the normalization of relations with the USSR started "sounding assembly," mobilizing their forces for a campaign against the ratification of the treaty. The U.S. Administration is keeping its word and defending the treaty. But at the same time it is giving the nod to extreme right-wingers in their anti-Soviet, anti-communist rhetoric, not only in words, but in definite militarist-style actions on the old pretext of the "growing Soviet threat." We have had further provocations on our borders. The atmosphere that prevailed during my U.S. visit clearly did not suit some people.

The tone of militarist activity in the European sector of NATO has noticeably increased. They are rushing to organize "compensation" for the missiles due to be eliminated under the treaty. They are planning to modernize and build up "other" types of nuclear arms, particularly at sea and in the air, cynically stating that these are not covered by the treaty. We have again heard a categorical "no" from London, Paris, and NATO Headquarters in Brussels to the abandonment of nuclear weapons, even in the distant future. Words of approval for the treaty and the Soviet-U.S. talks on reducing strategic arms are accompanied by statements that France and Britain are by no means planning to stop building up nuclear weapons. On the contrary; following the signing of the treaty the NATO states have been demonstrating heightened activeness in bilateral and multilateral military integration.

The positive statements from high-ranking figures about our restructuring are again interspersed with waffle about the "expansion of communism" and warnings that it should not, allegedly, be forgotten "who we are dealing with" and that, since the present Soviet leadership is not about to change its system, this calls into question its "diplomacy of smiles." Again they are fussing about the futility of any talks with the USSR, since it allegedly "cannot be trusted" at all. A consolidation of reactionary and extreme anti-Soviet forces is under way. All manner of "analysts" and Kremlin-watchers make appalling recommendations to governments, poison the minds of the public, and try to scare them with the "catastrophic" consequences for the West should the disarmament process be continued.

Attempts to shift the ideological struggle on the issues of restructuring and disarmament to our territory and our environment have been stepped up. "Radio voices" spread provocative fabrications—about an increasingly

acute struggle within Soviet society or the Soviet leadership, and about the emergence and growth of "opposition" to restructuring and to the CPSU's foreign policy course. They want to sow a lack of confidence and faith in our ability to achieve the goals set by the party. The centers of antisocialist provocations are not just doing this with regard to the Soviet Union—we can clearly see that. They are hastening to develop new forms of subversive work against other socialist countries where the dynamic processes of the further improvement of socialism are also under way. They use specific methods for each country in order, so to speak, to take account of specific national features in their activity.

We know why they are worried. Not only because disarmament threatens the profits of the military-industrial complex and the income of those who make a good living out of it. But also because they are scared of a rebirth of the appeal of socialist ideas and an upsurge in the prestige of socialism as a society of working people. They are scared that there will again be growing sympathy for our country and that the Soviet Union will be "rediscovered."

All this undermines the "enemy image" and, consequently, the ideological foundations of anti-Soviet and imperialist policy. Things that served so loyally the reactionaries over the last few decades are being destroyed. That is why the "right wing" is unhappy about the innovative and peace-loving policy of the USSR. That is why they want to halt the momentum of disarmament, which is gathering speed. We must see all this and take appropriate measures in our ideological work and propaganda.

Comrades! Steps toward solving the Afghan problem are another significant international event, in parallel with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, taken since the last Central Committee Plenum. For a long time now this problem has had a profound and direct effect on the Soviet people's feelings and our entire society.

Following the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the Politburo made a hard and impartial analysis of the situation and started even at that time to seek a way out of it. But the practical solution of problems which would allow us to unravel the main knots of this most complex regional conflict proved to be a far from simple. Possibilities of achieving this emerged following the appearance of genuinely national forces headed by Najibullah on the political stage in Afghanistan in late 1986. There also emerged external prerequisites for settling the conflict in a way such as to make Afghanistan an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state. This conforms with the interests of the Afghan people. It also conforms with our own state interests.

You are familiar with the statement published 10 days ago. It actually says everything—how we will act and what we expect. It was greeted with understanding and

approval by our people, our allies and friends, and broad circles of the world public. As for those who intend to continue exploiting the Afghan problem for selfish purposes, the statement presents them with new realities which they will have to take into account. The coming months will show the true position of all parties involved in the political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan.

Of course, comrades, our involvement in the Afghan conflict is a highly complex problem touching on many aspects of what we have to overcome in the course of restructuring and the consistent transformation of the new thinking into practical policy. But the main point now is that the Politburo is acting on this issue, too, in strict conformity with the principled line set by the 27th CPSU Congress.

Generally speaking, we must say that both the scientific elaboration of the problems of the new thinking and their ideological substantiation are still at their initial stage. There is plenty of work to be done here in an atmosphere of expanding glasnost. The Soviet people display a natural desire to look into everything themselves, to gain a better understanding of what is happening, and even more so to become knowledgeable participants in the nationwide struggle against the danger of war and in developing international contacts.

This is precisely why all necessary conditions are being created for decisively enhancing the informative and intellectual standards of foreign policy propaganda and of explanatory work and comments on international issues. This is a very important sector of our ideological activity, because some people are somewhat confused in understanding the essence of the new thinking, just as they are about our ideas and changes on the domestic front. This is no wonder: The problems are quite important, they will only grow bigger, and a struggle is being waged around them.

We are witnessing and participating in an unprecedented phenomenon, a kind of paradox created by the great dialectics of world history. The accelerated internationalization of many processes on a worldwide scale is accompanied by a large number and variety of options for the national and regional development of countries and peoples. But both are aimed at strengthening the world's integrity. These matters still have to be mastered in theory and translated into policy. This is a theoretical and practical task with many ramifications.

We have countered the militarist doctrine which underlies the policy of strength with the concept of "balance of interests" and mutual equal security. Our state interests do not conflict with the interests of the peoples and the toiling masses of any other society. Unless peace is preserved there will be no progress at all, and it would be senseless to talk about anyone's interests outside the solution of this task. The struggle to exclude war from international politics is a struggle to save millions of

lives, primarily the lives of working people who are the first to suffer from any war and more so than anybody else. The establishment of normal, businesslike relations with countries from the opposite system, apart from anything else, would shake up anti-Sovietism and therefore anticommunism, thus easing reactionary pressure against democratic gains and aspirations.

The elimination of militarism—a question we have raised keenly and are approaching in a businesslike, realistic manner—not only helps to curb the most reactionary forces but also promises an increase in jobs everywhere. Alongside the immediate advantages to working people this will lead to the expansion of the economically and socially active section of the toiling masses, and the social base of democracy and progress.

The struggle for a new world economic order and for the overcoming of the flagrant crisis phenomena in the Third World ultimately means creating conditions for a human existence for more millions of people of entire continents and their involvement in historical making. That is a most important factor in world progress, independent development, and revolutionary transformations.

The complexities of world processes and the unpredictability of the twists and turns of world politics, the dimensions and extraordinary nature of the peace offensive we have mounted and which has met with unprecedented international response, the resistance of powerful forces which objectively have no interest in peaceful coexistence and, finally, the need to be understood correctly—all this raises not only our political but also our theoretical responsibility by an entire order of magnitude. The fundamental theoretical question currently facing both Marxists and their opponents is that of combining class-oriented and general human principles in real world development and consequently in politics.

The report on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution set forth essential stipulations on this score. A fundamental problem was posed: Is it possible at the present stage, with the interdependence and homogeneity the world has achieved by the end of the 20th century, to exert on the nature of imperialism influence of a kind which would block its most dangerous manifestations? The criteria have been outlined for the competition between different social systems as have the opportunities for their coexistence in forms which would rule out universal catastrophe. Our social science has begun to embark more boldly on an analysis of the features and basic signs of the new era.

The enormous mass of the world public regards our restructuring as a boon to all mankind and is reacting positively, and even sympathetically, to the transformations which we have initiated and our foreign policy, and many people are openly and actively supporting this policy. Throughout the world we have revived hope for the future. That is a big moral capital. We must treasure

it, and justify the trust which we can feel everywhere. That is one aspect of the matter, an aspect directly linked with the human factor but rooted in the objective processes of the present.

The other aspect is that of the substantial changes which monopoly capital and the society in which it rules have undergone. Furthermore completely new factors have appeared which have acquired decisive significance for present-day world development; the nuclear threat, the unprecedented social and international consequences of the revolution in science and technology, the ecological danger common to all, the fundamentally different situation in the sphere of information and all forms of communication. The aggravation of global problems and the realization of the need for international cooperation in resolving them—all this is working in favor of peace and disarmament. The results of the terrible experience of fascism and World War II continue to exert steady psychological influence on people in many countries.

All this is altering the correlation between the "party of war" and the "party of peace" within the framework of monopoly capitalism and its international political superstructure, between, as Lenin put it, the "crude bourgeois, aggressive bourgeois, reactionary bourgeois" (op. cit., vol 44, p 408) and the "pacifist camp" of the ruling class in the West. In brief, the international conditions under which we have entered a very important new phase of our revolution differ substantially from those in its previous stages.

The new thinking means the correct understanding of the new realities subjected to analysis by the method of dialectical materialism. It includes conclusions drawn from this analysis and checked against revolutionary Leninist experience and the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. I should also stress that the new thinking is based on Lenin's theory of imperialism, on his study of the nature of imperialism, which will never become "good." We have never had any illusions on this score.

The main link of the new thinking is the new role of general human values. K. Marx and V.I. Lenin indicated their importance. These were not merely general considerations stemming from the humanitarian basis of their teaching. In stressing the importance of the processes of internationalization taking place in the world, our great teachers revealed the objective basis of general human values, dialectically uniting them with socioclass values. Now all this is becoming the pivotal line of practical policy. This demand on policy is conditioned by both negative and positive processes of the present: on the one hand by the growth of the unprecedented dangers to the very existence of the human race and on the other by the increase in the role of the masses and the general democratic factor in domestic and world politics.

This also requires substantially different international relations. What precisely? What should be the initial and absolute principle governing these relations? We have

named it. We have spoken of it out loud and we do not cease to repeat it to everyone—from the U.S. President to our friends who are fighting for national independence and socialism. This principle is the recognition of freedom of social and political choice by each people and each country. This way of putting the question also contains no trace of utopianism or illusions. We are very well aware that diplomatic courtesies and propaganda will not convince the West of the need to recognize this principle.

Of course, we must in no way belittle the importance of our goodwill, of the new style of our international activity, of our desire for frank and fruitful dialogue for the sake of attaining that minimum of trust possible between members of opposing social systems, of our sincere rejection of ideologizing intergovernmental relations, of our readiness for compromise on an equal basis, without detriment to anyone's security—in brief, everything characterizing Soviet foreign policy in the period of restructuring.

But it is those very realities of the world today discussed above and reflected in the new thinking which are increasingly becoming the main "educator" in the recognition of the peoples' right to live in their own way, without outside interference. Incidentally, it is precisely because this thinking correctly reflects the world that we consider it suitable not only for ourselves but also for the rest of the world. These realities force all people to take stock of themselves inasmuch as ultimately they mean mankind's survival, the very existence of civilization.

The most important function, I would say the historical mission, of the forces of socialism, democracy, and progress, consists in expanding and consolidating realities and indeed creating new realities which would erect an insuperable barrier to the forces of aggression and intervention.

We, the Soviet Union, are creating and consolidating these realities by our restructuring. I want to repeat once again that all our foreign policy achievements and the very business of preserving peace are rooted here—in the successes of restructuring, in our work, comrades. But it is important that all our people should also master well the opposite: The success of restructuring is impossible without a foreign policy based on the new thinking.

Comrades! It is in this dialectical interconnection between the internal and foreign policy aspects that the ideological problems of restructuring at its new stage appear to us. They are again—but ten times more powerfully—directing our attention to a question which was raised so sharply a year ago at the Central Committee January Plenum—the question of cadres.

In organizational, political and ideological activities, which are live, dynamic and are being actively restructured, there must be no place for people like the Shchedrin character who said: "I don't understand new



ideas. I don't even understand why they should be understood." It is a calamity when a contemporary of ours thinks like that. It is three times worse if a party member or a leader who belongs to the party is infected with such sentiments. Let me say again and again: An example of democracy must be set by the party and every communist, regardless of his position. Without this the democratization process will not advance.

The party began restructuring with itself, with its cadres. A great deal has been done in party cadre work since the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum. The main criterion by which we have been guided is people's attitude to restructuring. The submission of reports by elected authorities on their leadership of restructuring has just ended in all party organizations. The reports showed that the bulk of the party members do not wish to accept inactivity, irresponsibility, inertia, or indifferent attitudes toward restructuring and will not tolerate perpetrators of empty talk and loud mouths. In the course of the meetings the work of over 4,800 party committees and buro was deemed unsatisfactory and over 89,000 members of elected authorities were replaced. This is the logical result of the creation in the party of an atmosphere of greater exigency toward cadres concerning restructuring.

We must advance consistently along this path, which means tirelessly learning democracy, as the time of restructuring demands. Learning democracy is a difficult thing. But we have reliable guidelines and a reliable Leninist method for such learning.

It involves the fearless development of criticism and self-criticism.

It involves a consistent desire to be in the thick of the masses, in the thick of the most burning questions of life.

It involves garnering together the sentiments, needs, and vital interests of working people and all social strata.

Finally, it involves asserting on a daily basis a Leninist, businesslike work style, whose main feature is reliance on the masses.

Of course, democratization must permeate all intraparty life—by increasing the role of elected authorities and resolutely intensifying the combativeness of party organizations.

We have to remember that our party's leading role is not something given by somebody on high for all time but has been won by several generations of communists and their selfless struggle for socialism and working people's interests. Today too—every day and every hour—we must confirm and affirm our right to be in the vanguard of the revolutionary renewal of society by persistent work for the sake of the people and the homeland.

In conclusion, comrades, I would like to point out that a considerable amount has already been done in almost 3 years if you compare our present-day life with what it was before the beginning of restructuring. But very little has still been done if you compare it with what we expect from restructuring and what our society can do. Many difficult problems have to be resolved on the way to a qualitatively new state of Soviet society.

We are approaching the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Our task will be to analyze in detail the fundamental results of 3 years of living and working in the conditions of restructuring and particularly of the first months of the operation of the Law on the Enterprise; to determine what points our party and society have reached and are in the process of reaching after having initiated the processes of democratization and begun the radical economic reform; to make specific decisions on the improvement of our political system and the party's role as the political vanguard at the new stage of the country's development. Powerful new impetus will thus be given to our revolutionary restructuring.

And so, a great deal of intensive work lies ahead. The volume of innovative ideas and proposals which have been emerging in the party and society recently is enormous. The heap of numerous specific questions is great and constantly growing.

How are they to be resolved? This is something we need to work on together, advancing step by step along the charted path. Our quest must be creative, bold, and at the same time businesslike and responsible; in a word, it must be Leninist and bolshevist.

(The speech was listened to with great attention and accompanied by sustained applause).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

### **On the Restructuring of Secondary and Higher Education and the Party's Tasks in Implementing This Restructuring**

*18020010c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 32-66*

[Report by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee delivered at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 17 February 1988]

[Text] Comrades!

One of the most important questions of the qualitative renewal of our socialist society is on the agenda for this Central Committee Plenum. It is a question of deepening the reform that we have undertaken in the public education system.

In Soviet educational establishments of all kinds and at all levels, 57 million students are today acquiring literacy and skills and following courses in the sciences. That is the statistic. Translated into the language of politics, this figure means that in the classrooms and lecture halls a generation is now growing up who will carry on its shoulders, in the not too distant future, a significant share of the work of implementing the policy of acceleration and renewal and the social transformations begun in April 1985. The type of general educational and vocational training that generation will have, and the philosophical concepts and moral values it will acquire—will determine to a decisive degree the fulfillment of the CPSU program adopted at the 27th Congress, the country's future, and the very fate of socialism.

Restructuring affects the schools too. That is why the state of affairs in our schools and their prospects are regarded by the Central Committee as a major political issue, and why it deems it necessary to attract the attention of the entire party, the entire people to this issue.

Restructuring which was launched on the party's initiative and which has gripped the country, is a multifaceted process. But all the initiatives and actions which comprise it have ultimately a common denominator—a turn toward people, toward their immediate needs and interests.

The party has firmly set a course arising from the Leninist concept of socialism as the living creativity of the masses. It is no sin against the truth to assert that in a very short space of time—less than 3 years—mighty new creative forces have been awoken among the people.

This is the objective of the radical economic reform that is now being implemented, with its categorical insistence on the direct dependence of the prosperity of every labor collective and every worker on the real results of their activity. The same is true of the process of socialist democratization of all our life, including the development of self-management principles in production. What we are doing and have already done in this respect is unprecedented, there is nothing similar in any bourgeois country.

In recent years the pace of the country's socioeconomic development has increased, the retooling of the national economy is expanding, and the material base of the sociocultural sphere is strengthening. A sound moral atmosphere is becoming established in society. The party is the organizer of the policy of restructuring, and its political authority is growing.

Under the influence of the active Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence and the ideas of a comprehensive system of international security proclaimed by our party, the first steps are being taken to restructure international relations and turn from confrontation to cooperation and nuclear disarmament.

As everyone knows, what lies behind these improvements are the decisions of last year's Central Committee January and June Plenums—decisions that are revolutionary in their content. Now it is necessary to take another major step along the path of augmenting the country's intellectual potential and elevating man in society. We must ensure that alongside the desire, alongside the opportunity to live and work in the new way, Soviet people also develop knowledge and skills, ideological commitment, and a high level of culture.

A clear understanding has developed in the leadership, the party aktiv, and wide public circles that **without major changes in the public education system, without the whole of society's turning toward the urgent problems in this area, we cannot achieve a rapid pace of creative work, cannot start climbing steeply uphill.**

The general conviction has strengthened in the course of preparations for the present plenum. Members and candidate members of the Central Committee and Central Committee departments took part. Analytical work was done on all levels, all facets of public education. The ideas of the union republic communist party central committees and a number of party obkoms, kraykoms, gorkoms, and raykoms were summarized. Letters from working people to the CPSU Central Committee and to the editorial offices of newspapers, television, and radio were studied. Information on the state of affairs in education abroad was taken into account.

Useful meetings with workers in secondary and higher schools, scientists, leaders of party and soviet agencies, and creative workers were held at the CPSU Central Committee and locally. Much food for serious thought was provided by exhibitions of teaching aids and the conference on the development of VUZs. All this time the topics of education, childhood, and youth upbringing were constantly in the press and on our television screens and were regularly discussed on the radio.

In the process of preparations for the plenum a number of specific problems were solved. Many legal documents which tied the hands of school, college, and technical school principals and rectors of VUZs were revoked. The conversion to differentiated salaries of teachers was planned. Important decisions were made on radically improving retraining and the qualifications of cadres. Other measures were implemented.

In a work, comrades, the conclusions and proposals being submitted for your consideration reflect the opinion of the country's party organizations and the Soviet public.

Nonetheless, as you will realize, many questions have no simple answers. The Politburo believes that the final decision on them can only be made after detailed discussion at the present plenum.

### **I. Public Education—A New Qualitative Standard**

Comrades! Soviet education has traveled a long, difficult, but very fruitful path. Literally everything that forms the strength of our country today—the highly developed economy, rich socialist culture, advanced science—all this has its roots in the classrooms and VUZ lecture halls.

Under the Soviet system some 70 million workers, more than 35 million specialists with secondary and more than 22 million with higher training have attended educational establishments. A new socialist intelligentsia has been formed, with its national detachments. Education to at least secondary level has become the standard.

Something else must also be said. The severe trials suffered by our society orphaned millions of children. Their social protection, education, and teaching was undertaken by the state—mainly in children's homes and boarding schools.

The party and the Soviet people pay due tribute to the pedagogical feat of the teachers, tutors, professors, pioneer leaders, mentors, and organizers of school and VUZ work, and cordially thank them for their zealous work in raising the growing generation.

### **Some Results of the Reform Under Way**

The merits of our schools are significant and undisputed, and it is important to preserve and consolidate everything of value that has been developed in public education by generations of enthusiasts. It is on this basis that it is necessary to raise to a new level of quality the teaching and instruction of young people and the training and improvement of qualifications of specialists and work cadres. The reform we have begun in the schools and in higher and secondary specialized education is not the result of anyone's subjective wishes, but our society's natural response to the challenge of the time, to the demands of restructuring.

What could be numbered among the positive results of the stage we have passed through? First and foremost, the fact that central and local party, soviet, and economic authorities have begun to tackle in a more practical way the entire range of issues in public education. This is characteristic, for instance, of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Lithuania, and of Volgograd, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, and Rostov Oblasts.

Certain positive changes are taking place in the content and methods of education and in the labor instruction of schoolchildren. The training of multiple-skill workers within the system of vocational and technical education is expanding. A number of organizational and educational measures are making it possible to increase the students' responsibility for their studies, and the teachers' for the standard of teaching.

The integration of higher education with production and science is being stepped up. About 1,000 branches of VUZ departments, science laboratories, and other joint subdivisions have been set up at enterprises, associations, and scientific institutions. Dozens of educational institutions are taking part in the work of intersectorial scientific and technical complexes in the most promising areas of science and technology.

Changes have taken place in school financing. The residual approach in the allocation of funds for the sociocultural sphere is becoming a thing of the past. In the current 5-year period 70 percent more capital investments are being channeled into public education than in the last one. Teachers' salaries and scholarships for students and postgraduates have been substantially increased. The salaries of workers in higher education will be raised.

The attitude to the material needs of the schools on the part of local authorities and economic sectors is changing. In 1985-1987, for instance, Russia's vocational and technical education system received from the ministries equipment, materials, and financial resources totaling more than 1.5 billion rubles. In the period of the reform Kiev's enterprises have appropriated 43 million rubles for the construction of general educational schools. This amounted to nearly 40 percent of all the capital investments used in the city for such purposes. These are examples worthy of support. The practice of financing education out of different sources must be developed, especially since appropriations for public education must be still further increased.

In short, in summing up the distance traveled in the years of reform, it would be wrong to ignore the changes that have taken place. However, the conclusion drawn by M.S. Gorbachev at the 27th CPSU Congress that "the pace and depth of implementation of the measures envisaged in the reform cannot yet satisfy us" remains highly relevant. This applies to what is most important—the content of education and the methods of teaching and instruction.

So far progress has been confined to insignificant developments. There is a clear gap between the present state of secondary and higher education and the atmosphere of dynamism that is increasingly sweeping over the country. People sense this and are sounding the alarm. The conviction has developed in society that the reform has become bogged down in numerous problems.

A slowing trend has emerged in the development of education compared with global standards. Unless we reverse this trend rapidly, this will mean in time, sinking into the most dangerous kind of sluggishness for society, which it will take decades to correct. We therefore need a profound and objective analysis of the whole range of delaying factors. We need a bold, open look, unclouded



by stereotypes, at the realities and the future of Soviet education. Only thus can reliable means of deepening and accelerating the reform be developed.

The greatest difficulties are being encountered in reforming the general educational and vocational school. The school reform, which was started before April 1985, is an attempt to make changes in only one area of social life—education, and not even the whole of it, but only its primary level.

From the standpoint of the experience accumulated in restructuring, the inadequacy of the measures outlined by the reform and the desire to implement them with the old methods are clearly visible. This should be stated frankly.

First, the evolutionary nature of the reform was contrary to the revolutionary nature of the restructuring of society undertaken by the party. This is one of the main sources of the problems that arise. The reform was based on the idea that the public education system needs only some improvements. It was not taken into account that for some time the content of school work and its scientific, pedagogical, cadre, material, and technical backup, management, and regulations have required radical updating. Hence the lack of resolve, the lack of a large-scale approach to the reform.

Second, the concept of the reform is oriented toward extensive approaches to the school's implementation of their social task. It encouraged the general educational school to develop the mass vocational training of students in the senior grades in the simplest skills. Directing eighth-graders to rural vocational and technical schools increased at a rapid pace, often at the cost of arbitrary reduction in admissions to the ninth grades of schools and to technical schools. At the same time there was a drop in the enrollment of 10th-graders into colleges, by nearly 15 percent in the last 4 years.

This approach conflicts with present socioeconomic realities, in which it is specifically [demands] on the standard and quality of workers' training that is steadily rising. In our day, when the idea put forward by the party of intensification, efficiency, and quality is penetrating not only the economy, but literally every sphere of people's social activity, it is clear that the extensive guidelines and instruments applied in the school reform will not always take the schools in the right direction.

Third, the reform did not establish a program of profound democratization of the public education system. It was not backed up by setting up mechanisms for involving the whole of society in the process of the schools' restructuring. That is why not much is yet changing actually in the schools, colleges, technical schools, and VUZ departments. The restructuring of higher and secondary education is also at a standstill because the

decisive figure—the teacher, the tutor—is not really involved. To this day the student collectives have not been brought into the whirlpool of changes.

The "stalling" of school restructuring is also due to the sluggishness of organizational work to bring forward the planned transformations. In Tajikistan, Turkmenia, and Uzbekistan the republic communist party central committees and councils of ministers have not really set about tackling public education questions. Here there is more talk than action in relation to school reform. The party and soviet authorities of Dagestan and Smolensk, Tambov and a number of other oblasts of the RSFSR have not ensured a radical change in the style and methods of work to implement the reform.

The lack of a single center of reform leadership had its effect. The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, Central Committee departments, and the USSR Council of Ministers did not adequately monitor the implementation decisions on secondary and higher education or ensure persistent attention toward the development of education on the part of ministries, departments, and local party and soviet agencies.

The management of the schools by the Ministry of Education and the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education is carried out primarily by bureaucratic methods, in a conservative spirit. They are still trying to resolve the new tasks by decree methods, and themselves not infrequently show organizational sluggishness and inflexibility. By no means have all the sectorial ministries found the strength to abandon the mentality of "benefactors" to the schools, colleges, and institutes and really become committed and direct participants in their restructuring.

On the grass-root level meaningful work and methodological assistance to the teacher is often replaced by general recommendations and excessive monitoring of the "percentage coverage." Secondary and higher schools have difficulty in finding their way out of the labyrinth of all kinds of instructions, prescriptions, and reports that have enmeshed them over many years. This thicket has certainly spread beyond all measure.

Excesses and exaggerations were manifest in having children start school at the age of six. Many leaders have shown a preference for high indicators rather than real results. In many republics, krais, and oblasts classrooms for 6-year-olds consist of converted Pioneer rooms and libraries, or else some of the students were switched to second or even, in some places, a third shift. This can do nothing but harm. A major, socially significant matter cannot be dealt with in a hurry. What is needed is skilled, patient work in which all the details have been thought out.

The course of the restructuring of secondary and higher education has been discussed widely in the press, television, and radio for a long time. Many practical proposals, hard-won from experience, have been suggested. Many of them will certainly be woven into the tissue of the Central Committee Plenum's policy decisions.

At the same time, unacceptable views have been voiced in the debates. One of them is that if anything is to be changed in the schools, let it be gradually and partially. We cannot agree with this opinion. Public education needs radical changes. The schools cannot follow in the wake of social restructuring. Others propose basically destroying the edifice of the public education system and erecting a new one in its place. This approach is also unacceptable. In the reform of education the most important thing is not destruction, but construction, and we are carrying it out on the basis of the unquestionable achievements of Soviet secondary and higher education.

#### Ways of Deepening the Restructuring of Schooling

What are the constructive ways of effectively restructuring public education?

First of all there are grounds for making **fundamental changes** in the principles of reform of the general education and vocational school, changes in line with the ideology and practice of restructuring society as a whole. Basically they must predetermine:

—The formulation and implementation of the concept of the general education of young people as the basis for subsequent training of skilled worker and specialist cadres through all existing channels;

—Extensive technical re-equipping of the secondary, vocational and higher school, and conversion to standardized planning of the development of public education sectors and the future creation of conditions for their partial self-support;

—Elimination of departmental barriers and implementation of a unified state policy in the sphere of public education, and strong interaction among all types of educational establishments and scientific and production collectives in order to ensure the efficient utilization of material resources and society's intellectual potential;

—Involvement of all social forces in the country in the process of the renewal and development of public education through the mechanisms of democracy; the rejection of command methods in managing public education, greater independence and responsibility for faculties, and the maximum delegation of authority to them and to local soviets and territorial management bodies;

—Fundamental reorganization of the system for training and retraining teaching cadres and of scientific research in public education, gearing it to the tasks of restructuring the secondary and higher school.

Following existing reform guidelines also requires considerable adjustment. It is important for educational personnel, state institutions, and local party organizations to act most vigorously in this area. It is a matter of closely linking adopted decisions and measures on restructuring schooling to radical changes in other areas of social life, and of imparting modern content to the fundamental Leninist tenets on the development of socialist education as unified, labor and polytechnical schooling.

There is no doubt that our schooling is and will remain **unified** in the sense of its ideological education thrust, an identical launching pad for all, one which gives everyone equal opportunities to display their gifts and fulfill their social destiny.

There is no doubt that Soviet schooling is increasingly intended to be a **labor** schooling. That is, children should be taught to work collectively from a tender age, and respect for labor and for working people must be instilled in them. Labor training must be closely linked with developing in young people a solicitous attitude toward public property and to nature.

It is important for school work to be purposeful and socially profitable; not the labor of Sisyphus—a totally sterile and futile waste of effort and therefore something that is seen as a heavy burden by the school itself and by students and parents.

There is no doubt that our schools will be able to develop productively while remaining **polytechnical**. This means that it is necessary to acquaint students in theory and in practice with all the main sectors of production: at school—by providing an understanding of the technological application of scientific laws and the basic principles of labor organization in industry and agriculture; in the system of vocational and technical and higher education—by training expert, multiple-skill workers and specialists capable of operating in constantly changing production conditions. Whatever sphere of activity a young person chooses he will be dealing, one way or another, with an engine, a computer and complicated instruments and apparatus. Economic and legal knowledge will always come in useful.

Everyone accepts the principles of unified, labor, and polytechnical schools. But in fact we have made them incredibly rigid and formal. Thorough efforts will have to be made to break down the barrier's of dogmatism and conservatism which still litter the field of education.

Schools must not be uniform in the primitive sense of stereotypes and standardization which still determine the work of entire education collectives and also strongly affect school management.

Years of working by instructions have taught us to toe the line to such an extent that even now a considerable segment of our teachers and VUZ lecturers are afraid of any opportunity to break new ground and cling to habitual, sanctioned models and schemes. This problem does not affect public education alone.

True socialism which uncompromisingly defends its values has nothing in common with standardization of forms and working methods, with the streamlining of ideas, conduct, and actions. **More socialism means more variety.** It means a multifaceted reality in which truth is not dictated but explained by democratic means in an open and honest comparison of stances and arguments and tested through socialist practice.

The years of sliding into stagnation serve as a grim reminder of the fact that the fewer alternatives there are in the process of creating something new, the greater the likelihood of mistakes, while the scope for expression of talent, initiative, and innovative spirit shrinks like a piece of chamois.

This is why we must approach the current and future tasks of our entire public education from these positions, which provide socialism with a wealth of color and broad social scope for searching, experimenting, and fruitful manifestations of variety.

The prevailing viewpoint is that we must primarily ensure the establishment of the general education school as the truly basic component of the system of continuous education of our citizens. It is called upon to provide high-quality secondary education for all our young men and women. Subsequently they must be given the opportunity—bearing in mind their personal and society's interests, individual aptitudes, and the educational standard attained—to consciously choose between enrolling at a VUZ, a technical college or a vocational and technical school, or else learning a trade directly on the shop-floor. Here we must invariably proceed from the premise that the duration of the "basic education-to-learning a skill" cycle should not detain young people from active participation in social production for too long.

Basic secondary education must be viewed as the socially necessary level of knowledge, labor skills, cultural development, ability to think independently, to constantly absorb new knowledge, to adapt to new demands regarding improved qualifications or switching jobs in the course of scientific and technical progress, and playing an active part in sociopolitical life.

Naturally, determining the actual volume and specific content of basic secondary education, defining its humanitarian and natural science components, and clarifying the structure and duration of training in the general education schools must be left to experts and state administration with help from the public. This is their direct and most immediate task. In tackling it they should, in our view, be guided by the following approaches:

**The quality of knowledge must take first place.** At present this criterion has been relegated to a secondary role.

At the beginning of the current school year a state check to determine the general educational standard of first-year students arriving from schools and vocational and technical schools was made at a number of VUZs and technical colleges. It involved 27,000 students and revealed on the whole a cheerless picture. Around 25 percent of VUZ students and more than 45 percent of secondary specialized educational establishment students failed to meet the standard targets. At the Ivanovo Construction Engineering Institute, for instance, more than 70 percent of first-year students flunked math.

This reveals the obvious gulf between the proclaimed goal of obligatory general secondary education and the actual standard attained by the majority of students. The bridging of this gulf will be one of the key prerequisites for improving the atmosphere in the education system as a whole.

The way to this goal lies through giving schools the right to engage in creative work, to select their methods of teaching and organization of study and instruction and to work out innovative educational ideas; not trampling underfoot but fostering those particular schools whose image is determined by the activity of talented teachers who do not think along customary lines and who are dedicated to their work. Developing different models of schools, boarding schools, children's homes, and study and instruction complexes of preschool, schooling, and extramural institutions linked by common goals and ensuring the development of children's and teenager's creative abilities is the paramount task.

It is necessary to resolutely intensify the study and instruction process, to integrate study courses by reducing the number of subjects, to differentiate teaching, and to develop students' desire to master knowledge outside the mandatory syllabus. In a work, this means paying **attention mainly to the development of student's individual abilities.** In today's world, this is a key avenue for advancing school and VUZ work.

The country has slightly more than 4,000 specialized classes providing in-depth study of Russian and foreign languages, literature, geography, biology, chemistry, information science, history, and social sciences or catering to a musical or sporting inclinations. Bluntly speaking, this is just a drop in the ocean.



We must boldly embark on increasing their number by relying on the best experience. For example, places in Moscow University's Physics and Mathematics Boarding School are filled mainly by senior students, showing special gifts in physics and mathematics, from central Russia, the Urals, and southern Russia and mainly from the countryside and smaller towns. In addition to the teachers, study sessions at the school are conducted by eminent scientists, scientific associates, and postgraduate students. Practical work in physics and mathematics is done at the university laboratories. Much attention is given to contacts between students and their mentors. Moscow State University is really implementing the behest of its founder, M.V. Lomonosov, who said: "Universities must run their own high schools, without which a university is like a field without seeds."

Similar schools, which also operate successfully under some other VUZs, have a great future. There is good reason and actual opportunities to significantly expand the number of boarding schools specializing in music, choreography, painting, and so on under fine arts VUZs.

It is well-known that a real worker is not the one who work meticulously but the one who enjoys his work. This involves the development of a person's individual abilities from childhood. The most important point is to teach young people how to learn and to work, to build up inside school pupils and students—figuratively speaking—a critical mass of knowledge and skills capable of self-development in the process of man's further education and self-education in line with the infinite diversity of life's demands.

In a word, the fundamental aspect of restructuring is to ensure that, while consolidating and substantially strengthening the school's general educational function for all, it should be developed to suit the individual abilities of everyone.

This leads to yet another exceptionally important issue—the organization and fine tuning of a **vocational guidance system**. This demands special meaningful and absorbing pedagogical methods and work forms, capable of helping every young person to find himself, so to speak, and to find his place in society's creative labor. It may be necessary more resolutely to implement a policy of setting up a specialized state service with a ramified network of vocational guidance centers.

An atmosphere of persistent study must permanently reign in our schooling. Unfortunately, we are drifting away from this tradition and have diminished the incentives for outstanding study achievements. Many student collectives have lost their sense of creative competitiveness. Time and again young students are diverted for prolonged periods of time for work or projects which have nothing to do with their studies. In Uzbekistan's schools, for example, this results in the 10-year program often being compressed into 8.5-9 years. And this is happening in a republic with about 1 million able-bodied

people who are not engaged in social production but who could be actively employed in it. The average loss of [trained] in the country at large by VUZ students is equivalent to an entire semester of study time. These losses are irreparable, but nobody has ever been held responsible for them.

It is time to fully restore and reinstate the status of study as socially meaningful labor, to restore the high prestige of the school medal and the diploma cum laude and to make them worthwhile evidence of society's recognition of the success which students can achieve only after a number of years of determined work.

In the interests of raising the quality of general education it is necessary to reassess the expediency of continuing mass vocational training in secondary schools. Practice shows that there is no cause for high hopes here. Most schools have no facilities, cadres, or time to train young people in the difficult skills of the future. The training offered in the so-called functional or very simple jobs does not interest schoolchildren. It is quite understandable that the overwhelming majority of them do not link their future with the trade they have acquired in school. Thus it makes sense to **free our schools from the obligation to provide mass vocational training for worker cadres** for the national economy and give them the opportunity to use their potential to ensure the highest quality of general and labor education for young people.

Such proposals are being submitted by the AUCCTU, the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, the Ministry of Education and the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, local party committees and public education, authorities, teachers, and school principals. They should be examined and supported. It goes without saying that where conditions permit school children's' vocational training could be continued.

I should also like to stress once again that this is by no means a question of weakening the labor principle in school. On the contrary, it must be comprehensively strengthened. To this end it is necessary to boost efforts aimed at developing the network of study and production combines, school workshops, and apprentice teams and sections in enterprises.

Our **vocational and technical education system** is a real training ground for worker cadres. It has come a long way from the factory and plant training schools to the modern vocational and technical colleges. Its students have gone on to form the nucleus of the Soviet working class, which has justified its historic role as the vanguard of society at all the most demanding stages of the formation of our state, the building of socialism, and the protection of socialism's gains.

Now, as before, the working class is the main force for accelerating the country's development and the mover of social transformations. In a whole series of trades the

labor of the modern worker is close to that of the engineer and involves technical calculations, tuning and the adjustment of complex units, machines, machine tools, and technological systems. In view of the comprehensive introduction of cost accounting, the brigade contract and contract relations, our workers need a solid economic and legal training. Ultimately the inculcation of a high sense of civic responsibility for the fate of restructuring and a creative approach to work is impossible without mastering and multiplying the revolutionary and labor traditions of the working class, which have been and will remain a powerful factor for increasing the social activeness of new generations of working people.

Training the industrial and agrarian workers who meet these requirements is also the social function of the state system of vocational and technical education which consists of more than 8,000 schools of various types and graduates 2.5 million skilled cadres a year—two-thirds of the reinforcements of worker collectives.

In the light of today's guidelines it is clear that this system is still not keeping pace with the development of production. A skill shortage has come to light among worker cadres: the technological complexity of jobs is increasing considerably faster than the level of workers' skill. A check at a number of enterprises showed that this gap amounts to an entire skill category.

Vocational and technical education must be developed and strengthened as an integrated state system geared to the future. Hence it is necessary to organize vocational and technical education primarily on the basis of general secondary education. There are quite a few weighty arguments in favor of this: The constantly changing nature of production work and the transfer of cadres from one sector to another, which make it necessary to rapidly retrain workers and improve their skills; the demands on the cultural standard necessary for self-education and for education by correspondence and at evening school, and for active participation in self-government. This can only be done on the basis of a sufficiently thorough mastery of the fundamentals of science. By the way, in the industrially developed countries a skilled worker is now trained as a rule on the basis of secondary education. Indeed, as a rule on the basis of secondary education. Indeed, this practice is quite widespread in our country too. Each year vocational and technical schools receive some 700,000 secondary school graduates. This will make it possible to attain a higher standard of work in the future.

Of course, you have to remember that some young men and women, for one reason or another, will not be able to complete their studies in a general education school. In view of this it is expedient to retain the vocational and technical schools where they could learn a trade, and—with good teaching facilities—a secondary education also.

The reality is such that the majority of vocational and technical schools are geared to train worker cadres for base enterprises. Wherever ties are well established the present practice has a considerable number of pluses. At the same time, in the interests of improving the quality of student's vocational training and making better use of the material base, the range of vocational and technical schools must be comprehensively enriched. The long-term aim is to establish specialized schools, primarily in large cities, which can train up-to-date, skilled workers in complex and integrated trades and turn these vocational and technical schools into territorial-sectorial and intersectorial training establishments. As the network of these develops, it would be possible to make them the focus of training and retraining worker cadres in line with agreements reached with associations, enterprises, and economic units at their expense.

The secondary specialized academic establishment must assume a proper place in the system of vocational training. Every year they produce almost 1.3 million specialists who replenish the ranks of the working class, the engineering and technical intelligentsia, and workers in the social area.

For the secondary specialized school to reach a qualitatively new level there must be radical changes in the structure and content of cadre training and in the forms of organizing the study and instruction process. Here as well it would be expedient to convert to a system whereby specialists are trained, as a rule, on the basis of secondary education. Moreover, this will give technical school graduates a real opportunity to continue their training in VUZs by following an intensive curriculum.

It is important to develop reliable forms of linking studies to production and practice, such as the combined enterprise-technical school and the sovkhos-technical school. Ideas for improving the regional distribution of technical schools deserve our attention.

It seems a valid idea to train highly skilled workers in technical schools in the difficult trades, and those who show the greatest ability can go on to become middle-level brigade leaders and specialists. Steps must be taken to open departments in technical schools to retrain cadres. In short, all these issues must be resolved.

The higher school now has major tasks. It is responsible for replenishing the ranks of the people's intelligentsia with representatives from all classes and social groups and people from all of our country's nations and ethnic groups. VUZs have an extremely great role to play in shaping society's ideological, political, and moral climate and in enriching the country's spiritual and cultural life. Meanwhile, there is a great deal that does not satisfy us in the work of the higher school—both in its organization and in its results—particularly now, in the demanding conditions of restructuring.

For example, people are rightly concerned by the persisting disproportions in the national economy's availability of engineering cadres. In a number of disciplines, considerably more such cadres are trained than are actually needed. At the same time, those in charge have failed to respond to the growing shortage of cadres in electronics, instrument making, automation, robot technology, and a number of other areas. Moreover, the practice of equalization is still making itself felt in production, which undermines the prestige of engineering work and has a negative impact on the dynamics of scientific and technical progress.

Today we are acutely aware of the shortage of economic specialists, particularly in management. The economic training of all cadres generally needs to be fundamentally improved. There must also be a change of attitude toward training specialists in law, applied sociology, and psychology. With the increasingly intensive introduction of cost accounting and self-financing in economic life and deepening democratization and self-management, the need for such specialists will increase.

There are a considerable number of obviously inferior VUZs. Nevertheless, more and more new requests are being made to open more institutes and universities. Having achieved what they set out to do, local and central authorities often wash their hands of the matter and show no concern either for the material facilities or for the cadres reinforcement of the new academic establishment.

Such was the case in Khabarovsk, Grozny, Dzhzhkazan, and several other cities. A total of 154 VUZs have been opened in the last 20 years, and still, in 44 of them, there are only one or two doctors of sciences and professors—and none at all in eight of them. How can we talk about quality teaching here?

It is essential to carry out the certification of VUZs in a systematic and rigorous way, to help the weak ones, and, where need by, turn them into branches of prestigious educational establishments. New institutes must, as a rule, be created through the organization and gradual consolidation of local branches of major VUZs. That is precisely how the Lipetsk Polytechnic and Vilnyus Construction Engineering Institutes and the Donetsk University developed. Such practices must become the standard.

Last year laid the foundation for major changes in the activity of higher education. The basic thrusts of its restructuring were drawn up in the light of the new approaches in the economy, social development, and all spheres of our life. The principal characteristic of the adopted documents is its comprehensive nature which enables considerable progress to be made in implementing Lenin's idea of integrating education, production, and science. That is the main thing. All our efforts must be directed to that end.

Just as a modern economy cannot do without competent cadres and the all-around involvement of higher education in speeding up scientific and technical progress, VUZs will not achieve fundamental improvements in their activity without close ties with production and national economic practice. For them this serves as an obligatory and indispensable training ground for the new type of specialist.

Mastering the new kind of relations between higher education and national economic sectors and developing the economic mechanism for their collaboration, which would increase the incentive for VUZs to establish ties with enterprises, are the order of the day. That is one side of it. On the other side, it is essential that all economic leaders and labor collectives actually realize that in showing concern for higher education one is showing concern for the future of every enterprise and sector and the entire national economy.

Since the beginning of this year material production sectors have contributed funds for the development of educational institutions at the rate of 3,000 rubles for each specialist trained for them. This approach creates the economic prerequisites for strengthening business links between higher education and production.

The USSR Gosplan must, as of the 13th 5-Year Plan, make changes in the procedure for planning and assigning specialists in the light of concluded contracts. In addition to the assignment plan—a kind of state order for specialists—educational institutes will assign some of their graduates on the basis of direct contracts with enterprises.

We must admit that great harm was caused by the unjustified restrictions in force until quite recently involving our national economic specialists and scientists in teaching in VUZs and other educational establishments on a dual-job basis. These restrictions consolidated and, in a number of places, widened still further the gap between higher education and science and production. The restrictions on holding more than one job have now been lifted and practical efforts by VUZs are essential if the broken ties are to be restored as quickly as possible.

Pooling the potential of VUZs, production, and academic science creates a reliable basis for radically improving the quality of specialist training. We have both traditions and rapidly gained experience in using this training method.

Take, say, the training-scientific production complexes. Created on the basis of VUZs industrial enterprises, associations, and scientific establishments, they are already operating at Gorkiy University, the Tomsk Polytechnic and Taganrog Radio Engineering Institutes, and a number of other VUZs.



Novosibirsk University has been functioning as an unified scientific education complex since its inception. Some 468 scientists from various institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, including 24 academicians and corresponding members, work there as lecturers and departmental heads on dual-job terms. In turn staff lecturers, postgraduates, and university students carry out scientific research in academic institute laboratories. Practice has confirmed the great efficiency of this kind of cooperation and exchange.

At the same time inter-VUZ cooperation, where joint departments and centers providing production and technical backup for scientific work, study and medical and communal services for students and lecturers and inter-institute stadiums and clubs are set up within a city, is yielding good results.

The modern university or polytechnical VUZ has at its disposal facilities for comprehensive research into major problems and can attract the most talented and well trained young people into scientific work and rapidly organize scientific research into and solution of specific problems in the newest areas of science and technology. It is no accident that the higher educational establishments are the leading national scientific centers in practically all developed countries. In view of this it is necessary to set about redistributing state appropriations for the development of scientific research.

In our conditions the scientific potential of VUZs is not adequately utilized. Since the publication of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on stepping up the role of VUZ science there have as yet been no marked improvements, except for individual VUZs.

Higher education, like secondary education, cannot get by without a diversity of organizational structures of teaching and upbringing. Its potential is considerably increased by close cooperation with academic and sectorial institutes and with enterprises and associations. This must become the predominant form of scientific research and specialist training in higher education. In this context it is important to remove departmental demarcations and break down the barriers that have been erected between VUZs and enterprises, between higher education and academic and sectorial institutes. Heads and party organizations of educational establishments are as yet working too slowly in this direction. Both academies and sciences and sectorial ministries are being sluggish.

The point, comrades, is this: If the country organizes close collaboration between higher education and academic and sectorial institutes, society will obtain on this basis, and without major expenditures, a tremendous increase in scientific potential and a high standard of training and retraining of specialists in the most important areas of science and technology. The times dictate a broad spectrum of integration—from ad hoc scientific

and technical collectives and secondments of VUZ teachers to academy institutes, to scientific research institutes and laboratories under dual jurisdiction (to the Academy and the Minvuz) and other subsidiaries of VUZ departments in organizations under the academies of sciences. At present many VUZs are isolated, like lone saplings in the steppe. Failing to change this situation means failing to achieve anything fundamentally new in higher education.

**Comrades! The restructuring of the country's public life and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress pose with unprecedented urgency the problem of improving cadres' qualifications and retraining them.**

Let us recall once again one of the last instructions that V.I. Lenin was able to give to us: "...First—study, second—study, and third—study, and then make sure that science in our country does not become a dead letter or a fashionable phrase (and there is no use denying that this happens particularly frequently in our country), that science really becomes part of our flesh and blood and is fully and genuinely transformed into an integral component" (*"Poln. Sobr. Soch."* [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 391).

The dynamics of social and scientific and technical development is now such that without the constant renewal of our knowledge and skills, it is simply inconceivable to keep up with it. Especially since a significant proportion of our cadres were formed in the years when work was assessed by criteria different from those used today. Today, for instance, it is not enough merely to know how to make intelligent use of allocated resources. He who also knows how to earn money wins the day. You will also agree that it is one thing to be oriented solely toward the requirements of the domestic market, and another to aid for the foreign market too. It is one thing for the financial aspect to be considered secondary as, let us admit, it has been, and another when finances become, for the economic manager, the most important tool in his activity.

The vast majority of people themselves seek to increase their stock of knowledge and skill. The task is to create a ramified network, a multifaceted system of study centers which will ensure that not millions, but tens of millions of workers whatever their level, rank, and position have the opportunity constantly to improve their qualifications, not only quantitatively, but also achieve qualitative improvements in their knowledge and skills.

As you know, the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have defined specific measures seriously to tackle this work on a nationwide scale. Alongside the reform of secondary and higher education, the creation of a cadre retraining complex will be an important stage in the establishment of an integrated system of continuous education.

The adopted resolution makes many demands on all ministries and all departments. Some of them will have to begin virtually from scratch, such as the USSR Ministries of the Electrical Equipment Industry, of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, and a number of others. All the rest will have to concern themselves with the construction of additional educational premises, living conditions for workers sent for retraining, and the selection and placing of teaching personnel.

The ramified structure of evening and correspondence teaching has become an important way for many people to exercise their constitutional right to education. But we must admit that it has serious defects and is often used as a simplified means of obtaining diplomas. The USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, in conjunction with other ministries, must speed up the elaboration of measures to radically improve evening and correspondence education in the country.

In short, the shaping of an efficient system for retraining cadres means a good deal of trouble. But the returns will be tangible too. First, economic returns, because of the pace of national economic development, the scientific and technical standard of production, and the quality of output depend directly on the level of qualifications of leadership cadres, specialists, and workers. Second, social returns, because it is, specifically, a matter of retraining for the switch to new types of activity, in the brief time that remains until the year 2000, approximately 16 million people who will be released in various sectors of production and management.

That is a very important aspect of the matter. Indeed, it would all be simpler if, in seeking to increase productivity, we were concerned only to obtain more output with a smaller number of workers. No, economic efficiency alone does not suffice. Socialism also demands social efficiency, without fail. That means that measures which release a worker from production must be inseparable combined with measures enabling him to join in the process of socially useful labor. The right to work is a lifelong right for every member of our society.

In general it is a question of setting up an all-embracing system of continuous education. This will organically combine preschool education, general educational training, vocational training, higher education, the constant enrichment of knowledge, and the improvement of the qualifications of workers and specialists. Such a system will be a real contribution to the implementation of the policy of restructuring and its slogan—more socialism!

#### **A Firm Material Base and Efficient Management for Soviet Schools**

Comrades!

A breakthrough to a new quality of education is possible only by paying nationwide attention to the needs of secondary and higher schools. Their most urgent and most immediate need concerns the fundamental strengthening and re-equipment of their study and production facilities. Given the entire complexity of this task, it will be necessary to seek out major financial, material, and technical resources.

Nowadays education is becoming increasingly expensive. Over the last 25 years the cost of education has increased by a factor of 4.7 and now amounts to almost 40 billion rubles. At the same time, there has been a persistent trend toward a reduction of its share of the state budget. It amounted to 11 percent in 1970 and 8 percent in 1986. Commissioning of school premises has been declining—from 8 million student places in the 9th 5-year period to 5 million in the 11th.

It must be frankly admitted that, despite the measures taken in the last few years, the material base of schools is experiencing difficulties from the viewpoint of modern demands. The moment of truth has arrived for schools—just as it did for the economy and for management, at Central Committee Plenums. Many preschool institutions, schools, vocational and technical schools, technical colleges, and VUZs especially teacher training ones, are overcrowded and the premises they occupy are often unsuitable for classes. This gives rise for numerous appeals by working people to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers. Here are just a few facts quoted from letters received.

"In our rayon," residents of the city of Izhevsk write, "second- and third-grade students attend school during the third shift because 1,500 children instead of 600 attend School No. 44. Even more 9-story blocks will be commissioned by the new year. Nobody can even imagine how the children will study then." The No. 113 school in the city of Ufa was built on marshland in 1939. "Its walls," a collective letter reports, "are soaked with dampness and frozen, windows and doors are warped because of the dampness and cannot be closed. The school was built to accommodate 320 pupils, but 850 children are studying there." Great difficulties are also reported in other materials received by the CPSU Central Committee.

According to official data, 21 percent of students nationwide are taught in school premises without central heating, 30 percent in premises without running water, and 40 percent in premises without sewerage. The number of children attending children's preschool institutions exceeds by over 1 million the number of available places.

Regarding general education schools, in order to reduce the number of students per class to the set standard, to complete the transition to starting school at the age of 6, to replace dilapidated and temporary accommodation, and to basically eliminate the need for shifts in study

sessions, it will be necessary to commission something in the order of 28 million student places in 1990-2000; in other words, commissioning during the 13th and 14th 5-year periods must approximately double in comparison with the current 5-year period (7.4 million places). During these 5-year periods the construction of preschool institutions must be maintained at the level of 4 million places in each 5-year period. It will be necessary to approximately double capital investments both in order to satisfy the needs of education, to bring study areas up to standard and to solve the paramount social and cultural tasks of higher and secondary specialized schools.

It has already been said that the new mechanism for collaboration between VUZs and the material production sectors, which envisages partial reimbursement of the costs of specialists' training and will be introduced in practice starting this year, will become a major source for the development of the material and technical base of VUZs. Estimates show that, during the very first year, a VUZ could earn an additional amount of over 300 million rubles for its development. When plans are drawn up, provision must be made for the allocation of appropriate material resources and construction organization capacities to VUZs. The expansion of soviets' rights in economic management, the new principles for drawing up local budgets, and the cost accounting interest of enterprises in the training of cadres for them will also produce additional sources to strengthen the material base of education.

Great opportunities exist in enhancing the efficient utilization of capital investment funds allocated by the state. Many construction organizations chronically fail to fulfill the plans for construction of national education projects, and 1987 was no exception. Only the Kirghiz and Armenian SSR's had handed over schools in accordance with the state plan by 1 September. There was a substantial lag in the commissioning of schools and vocational and technical schools in the RSFSR, Kazakhstan, and Estonia, as well as by the ministries of power and electrification, nonferrous metallurgy, and construction in the eastern regions of the country.

The material and technical base of VUZs is becoming worn out and obsolete faster than it can be renewed. Construction plans for VUZ projects have been frustrated year in and year out, for decades on end. This applies primarily to Moscow and Leningrad, where a considerable proportion of VUZ potential is concentrated. The V.I. Lenin Teacher Training Institute in Moscow has been under construction at snail's pace for more than 10 years. Considerable arrears have built up in Rostov-na-Donu, Kazan, and Perm. The complex of study premises for the Perm Polytechnic Institute has been under construction for almost 20 years instead of 7 as stipulated.

There are many complaints regarding the design of school and VUZ buildings. The best architects and

designers must be recruited for the design of study establishments, and their work must be organized on a competitive basis. School buildings must be the jewels of our cities and villages.

The inadequate availability of technical aids for training is a general problem for all schools, from kindergarten all the way up to VUZ. Is this not one of the reasons for our problems with the technical standards of production and the quality of work in the economy at large? There are all the necessary reasons to answer this question affirmatively. **The retooling of national education** is the paramount question today, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Approximately 2 billion rubles worth of text books, instruments, and furniture are needed annually to fully meet the requirements of the education system alone. At present there are quite a few schools where the main equipment essentially consists of a blackboard and chalk. There are 56 rubles worth of technical teaching aids per students, which is only 50 percent of the requirement under the present modest criteria. In vocational and technical schools, even newly built ones, old equipment dismantled at enterprises is being installed.

Great difficulties prevail in the provision of technical equipment for higher educational establishments, especially universities and medical and pedagogical institutes. VUZs meet only 15 percent of requirement for specialized teaching equipment from own production.

This is largely due to the poor organization of educational establishments' material and technical supply. Until recently they featured under the heading of so-called "sundry consumers." Now they are referred to in the Gosplan slightly more subtly as "Other Consumers." Essentially, of course, the situation is not going to change until the public education system is supplied with resources like any other national economic sector.

What is needed is literally a revolution in technical supplies to public education; what is needed is a range of measures to develop most modern models of training equipment and technical teaching aids, including children's toys, in line with world standards, and an expansion of their production at enterprises of the machine-building and defense complexes. At the same time it is necessary to build up the relevant production facilities within the public education system itself. The question has arisen of creating for this purposes intersectorial scientific production associations, with the participation of VUZs, schools, and colleges, which could assume responsibility for the implementation of a scientific and technical policy in the procurement of teaching supplies.

Supplies of high-grade computer equipment to the public education system must be sharply accelerated with the aim of resolving the **problem of the computerization** of schools and vocational and technical schools by the



beginning of the next 5-year plan. It is also necessary to ensure the supply of a sufficient number of modern professional computers to VUZs.

Computers are becoming a powerful means for the intensive study of various disciplines and an integral part of laboratory and research work. Therefore it is necessary to accelerate the priority development of study programs and teaching methods in subjects involving the use of personal computers. A very promising trend is the organization of information-science centers in the country's cities based on Moscow's experience. All strata of the population show interest in these centers. The State Committee for Computer Technology and Information Science must organize as quickly as possible the centralized assembly, repair, and technical servicing of computers used for training purposes.

Material facilities for the physical development of children and young people and the sensible organization of extramural time and leisure are still poor in our country. Leisure time should be filled literally to the brim with amateur art activities, regional studies, experimental activities, hiking, and sport. So far one in six of the country's rayons has no Young Pioneer or children's center, and the task of resolving this problem completely by 1990 is badly behind schedule. More than 40 percent of students in general education schools have no gymnasiums, and in rural areas the figure is even worse. A substantial number of secondary school and even university students receives insufficient physical training.

This situation will have to be drastically improved. However, let us be realistic. This is not an easy task, nor can it be achieved overnight. Are there other possibilities today? Indeed there are, substantial at that. It is a matter of making better use of existing facilities outside schools for sports and physical culture, and of providing access to all sports facilities belong to sports associations, enterprises, and educational establishments regardless of departmental affiliation.

Much needs to be done to organize catering facilities for students everywhere. The USSR Gosagroprom and republic councils of ministers must organize the production of the necessary range of food products for school cafeterias, and the USSR Ministry of Trade, Tsentrosoyuz, and local soviets must ensure the provision of schoolchildren and students with palatable meals with a good caloric content.

Publishing work for the needs of the public education system must be radically improved. Specifically, this applies to compiling, competitively selecting, and publishing textbooks and teaching aids, especially those written by teachers and lecturers. Further, the general standard and quality of printing and the standard of textbooks in general must be improved. The time needed to produce training publications must be substantially reduced with the help of new technologies. It is possible to increase nationwide the load on printing capacities for

the production of textbooks in a number of union republics and to consolidate the material base of publishing houses attached to higher educational establishments. Clearly, the time has come to establish an All-Union "Textbook" Publishing House. It ought furthermore to be supplied with the best-quality paper, and the Ministries of the Petroleum Industry and of Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry should be instructed to organize the supply of modern printing materials.

It must be admitted that the experience of funding and free textbooks to schoolchildren has revealed not only the advantages but also the disadvantages of this practice. Therefore, despite all the difficulties this may entail, it is necessary, starting with next year, to organize the additional production of textbooks to be sold freely.

As you can see, more than enough material problems have accumulated and they must be tackled in earnest. They have arisen because the perception of the Leninist understanding of the highest priority of schools' needs by central organs for the planning and management of public education has been blunted. They proceeded down the well-trodden path, adding something here and there to raise somewhat the achieved standard. Recurrences of this erroneous approach can be glimpsed even today; for instance, in the view that, with the production sectors' switch to cost accounting and self-financing, enterprises', and especially base enterprises', expenditure for assistance to schools will have to be curbed. This interpretation of cost accounting reflects the worst kind of routine economic thinking. This is because cost accounting also means taking a longer-term view and not forgetting the social aspect and that expenditures for people's development are highly advantageous even from a purely economic viewpoint. According to available estimates, each ruble spent on education corresponds to 4 rubles of national income.

One of the first documents of the Soviet system stated that expenditure for public education must be given high priority: A generous education budget is the pride and glory of every nation. This formula is part and parcel of the party's current sociocultural development policy.

Another decisive premise of accelerating restructuring secondary and higher education is the elimination of inertia and dogmatism in organizing the management of public education. This is being vigorously advocated by teachers, educators, and party and soviet officials.

They note that the barriers between the Ministry of Education, the State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education and the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education are so high and solid that they hamper the implementation of an integrated education policy. There are also quite a few other obstacles which divide the education sector. VUZs come under the jurisdiction of 74 ministries and departments, and technical schools come under the jurisdiction of 207

ministries and departments. This situation is simply abnormal. After all, it is perfectly clear that wherever there are no common aims and interests there can be no unity of action.

A characteristic feature of the current development of society is the intensification of integration processes in management with the simultaneous expansion of the independence and responsibility of primary, grassroots components and granting them rights and powers formerly wielded by superior authorities. If everything is left in its present state, the rights and powers of educational establishments and territories will again inevitably gravitate toward the center. Furthermore, the more "links" there are in the management system, the greater the likelihood of a spontaneous recurrence of its bureaucratization.

Other vital tasks in public education also call for the removal of organizational barriers. This applies to the consistent implementation of the principles of the continuity of education, the provision of better curricula, rational use of the cadre potential and material facilities, faster retooling of the teaching process, and the development of a state system of vocational guidance. Ultimately this means creating a public education system which will react sensitively and promptly to the dynamics of social life.

Many republics have proposed combining their education departments and creating state committees for public education. This question clearly deserves to be studied and resolved on the all-union level.

A serious defect of the existing administrative system for public education is that public participation in the leadership of school affairs has been greatly weakened.

The policy of keeping education a closed sphere accessible only to specialists is strong. It is for this reason that our school system has almost completely lost many of its features as a public state institution, as conceived by V.I. Lenin.

The alienation of the school from society has become impermissible and is especially obvious and unacceptable today, in the period of restructuring and when the party has vigorously called on the people to participate in state affairs. The dialectics of the time are such that the democratization of the school and VUZ systems is inevitably predetermined by the democratization of social life. But at the same time the transformation of social life is impossible without a democratic transformation of higher and secondary schools as institutions for reproducing society's spiritual structures.

We need a modern concept of **democratic administration of public education** and a transition from conservative administrative to democratic methods and, in part, to economic methods. It is a matter above all of ensuring the most extensive development of school and VUZ

self-management. It would be expedient for schools and vocational technical colleges to set up **educational establishment councils**. They could include representatives of the teaching staff, party, Komsomol, trade union, and student organizations and key enterprises, and parents. The councils should be fully empowered to examine questions of study, instruction, financial, and economic activity—that is, they should act as the full proprietors of each educational establishment. VUZs and technical schools should be more persistent and resolute in carrying out the measures in switching to self-management as laid down by the program documents on the restructuring of higher and secondary specialized education. The professors and students elected to academic councils should, like their colleagues, directly participate in running VUZs together with the social organizations. The party proceeds on the basis that the administration of public education is a matter for the toiling masses, and their social and state organizations. The principle of self-government should be reflected in school, vocational and technical college, and VUZ statutes, which are in need of urgent revision. This principle needs to be legislatively codified.

This prompts many questions which soviets of people's deputies must consider and work on creatively. It is proposed, in particular, to set up new elective and periodically renewable local education authorities to assume direct leadership of the preschool institutions and schools in a given territory. It is possible to look into the positive experience of the public education councils that operated in the country on the basis of extensive public representation. They became defunct in the thirties, as incompatible with the course being pursued at the time of increasing centralism in leadership.

It is now important to give new content and meaning to the idea of **public education councils**. Their task is to involve the public in the affairs of schools, VUZs and technical schools, to pool their efforts in the most important areas, to make full use of cadres and technical means, to disseminate advanced experience of teaching and education, to develop universal teacher training education, and to seek out opportunities for improving the material position of education establishments by attracting funds from public and cooperative sources and enterprises (on the basis of decisions by labor collectives), and through the creation of targeted funds.

I think that such representative councils should be elected at local education conferences with the participation of everyone involved in teaching and educating young people. The immutable principle must be to ensure the utmost democracy, openness, and glasnost. The councils should be headed on a voluntary basis by, obviously, one of their most prestigious members. The local city and rayon public education departments of soviets of people's deputies could be the working organs. This would retain the advantages of state control and public involvement in the Soviet education system.

The state and public system of the administration of public education must rest on a firmly scientific basis. In this respect it is necessary to review the role of the **USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences**. For a long time the work of the academy and its subordinate institutes was widely criticized for ducking the acute problems of the development of public education, for being divorced from real life, for its secrecy, and for lacking proper glasnost and democracy.

The time has come to embark on a profound reorganization of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. The first, but long overdue step, is to free it from the jurisdiction of the USSR Ministry of Education, transform it into an all-union, interdepartmental academy uniting scientific research organizations within the public education system, bring new blood into it, open the way to talented scientists and practical teachers, and resolutely extend its scientific boundaries. It should be a really new academy with a new staff, a new election procedure, and, possibly, with its members having to be periodically re-elected. It would perhaps be worthwhile to start by setting up a constituent authority.

The development of a democratic system for school and VUZ life and its unification with the science of education are questions of major state and sociopolitical importance. The Politburo believes that the results of the plenum's discussion will make it possible to find the most effective solutions consistent with the fundamental tasks of restructuring.

#### **Enrich the Content and Improve the Methods of the Party Leadership of Education**

Comrades!

The restructuring of the Soviet school and of the system of cadre training and retraining as a whole will be all the more successful the more actively the entire party, all its units and every party member sets about it.

#### **Educate Committed Fighters for the Ideals and Values of Socialism**

Giving young people a high-quality education is only one task of our secondary, specialized, and higher education. Another equally important task is to raise young Soviet men and women to be zealous bearers of revolutionary ideas and traditions, people with the desire and ability to defend and implement the party's policy aimed at comprehensively revealing socialism's potential and advantages.

That is our class demand on schooling. The party makes that demand on the mandate of the people, who fully accept the communist ideal of a society of comprehensively and harmoniously developed people.

Soviet school graduates are passing with honor the tests which befall the country and the people. Our young people demonstrate their ideological and moral maturity and fortitude in everyday labor, in the opening up of the new regions of Siberia and the Far East, and in the conquest of space. They have shown great firmness of spirit in exceptional situations—in the performance of their internationalist duty in Afghanistan and in eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl accident.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to have an idealized view of the young generation's life. Political indifference, a susceptibility to the influence of primitive spiritual products and bourgeois morality, and a weakening of moral resolve among certain groups of young people are also part of the reality, as is infiltration of nationalist delusions, as revealed for example by the events in Alma-Ata, Yakutia, and the Baltic republics.

Of course one cannot attribute all educational shortcomings to schools. But they do bear a certain blame. Formalism, a passion for ostentatious measures, and an unwillingness or inability to take account of age-related requirements are all present in school and VUZ affairs. Our system of public education must resolutely eradicate all this.

The great transformations which have been initiated in the country are having the most beneficial effect on young people's minds and souls. The general renewal of life in the country will be reflected in education. But we cannot expect things to take their own course or happen automatically in this sphere. The party's work in the ideological, moral, and political education of the growing generation will be all the more successful the more we enhance the role in that work of the organizations and institutions whose activity is aimed directly at young people. This fully applies to the Komsomol and the Young Pioneers and Octobrist movements, and, of course, the public education system.

In this matter we communists must direct attention to a number of problems which must be resolved if the instructional role of secondary and higher schools is not to run the risk of dropping below today's required standards.

The paramount question concerns the quality of **social sciences teaching**. Since the all-union conference of heads of social sciences departments (October 1986) a number of specific measures have been carried out to improve social science training in VUZs and secondary specialized educational institutions. New curriculums have been developed and work has begun to produce new textbooks. The rights of social science departments in restructuring the study process have been expanded.

Nevertheless, the deep gulf between VUZ social sciences and real life is being bridged too slowly. Young people's increased interest in the problems of restructuring, the processes of democracy, and the thorough consideration



of the distance covered by the Soviet people in the 70 years since the October Revolution has still not been properly reflected either in the content of the subjects being taught or in the nature of teaching. At VUZ seminars and school study sessions there is a marked lack of free discussion of topical questions, well-argued assessments, or thorough scientific analyses of processes, and phenomena occurring today before young people's very eyes. The task is to instill in young people a **modern dialectical thinking** and the ability to evaluate social phenomena from class positions, and to help them to see life in terms of its real contradictions and multifaceted nature.

This is especially important today when it often happens that people arbitrarily highlight one particular aspect of the past or the present, which serves certain interests, while ignoring another aspect which is not to their liking or does not fit into a certain scheme, as it were. That is how subjectivism develops, which has caused such harm to our science, literature, art and our cause as a whole, because subjectivism leads directly to a distorted interpretation of events and phenomena and to incorrect conclusions and decisions. Only he who has thoroughly mastered revolutionary theory and understood the truly scientific method—the dialectical method—can be a real Marxist. In this connection it is very important that young people learn to read V.I. Lenin and to think about his works for themselves. Party organizations in the Stavropol region, Ulyanovsk Oblast, and Kazan are giving educational institutions good help in this area.

Everyone has the opportunity to interpret reality independently, including the opportunity to assess it critically. In such a situation the ability to defend the ideals and values of socialism through one's own intellectual and emotional conviction rather than the prompting of others counts for a lot.

The Central Committee has already repeatedly voiced its disagreement with those who contend that we have overdone criticism, and have allegedly opened the doors of criticism too wide. In fact, the opposite is true: Surely we do not yet have enough in-depth and analytical criticism. The problem is quite different, namely that the sharpest criticism often proves ineffective.

If you listen carefully to young people, that is precisely what worries and disturbs them. For example, some outrage has been uniformly condemned, talked about from platforms, and written about in the newspapers, but no changes for the better are to be noticed. That in fact is the trouble.

At the same time it would be naive to suppose that correcting the shortcomings that have come to light is a job for the center, the authorities only. It is time both for adult citizens and young people just embarking on life to jettison such ideas. Socialism, its true face and further development, are the work of the people's hands, intellect, and energy.

The teaching of social science subjects must incorporate an effective antidote to social parasitism and political passivity. It must train staunch, resolute fighters bent on raising socialism to a qualitatively new level of development, people who, on meeting difficulties, do not despair or grumble but take practical steps to overcome them.

It is very important that in mastering social science subjects, young people develop a **class view of the world**, an understanding of the link between those interests common to all mankind and class interests. This includes an understanding of the class nature of the changes taking place in our country. A half-baked idea of "liberalizing Soviet society" is being importunately offered us from outside: liberalism in its Western sense, of course, where stress is laid on purely formal procedural elements so that capitalist relations may be reproduced. We, of course, have no intention whatsoever of copying bourgeois liberalism, that political fraud. Our way is clear. We are engaged in broadening democracy in the interests of working people, developing genuine self-government by the working people, and strengthening the political stability of society. That is why, incidentally, the Soviet people themselves cannot and will not be "liberal" toward encroachments on their socialist gains.

It is essential to highlight history among the various social science subjects. Thorough, thoughtful study of history is an immense instructive force. This particularly concerns knowledge of our motherland's revolutionary past and its accomplishments in building socialism.

We possess today a reliable methodological key to a correct, well-considered understanding of the various periods of our life, such as M.S. Gorbachev's report to the ceremonial session marking the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. The tenets and assessments presented in it serve as guidelines both for the development of historical science and the teaching of history.

A great deal is being said at the moment about historical truth. And bitter though it may be, it has to be talked about and written about in order that we may derive lessons for the present and the future. It is important to provide new generations with the full, unabridged truth, without vilification or embellishment. Everything is there—the joy of victory and the pain of failure, the heroic and the tragic. But the main thing is that we have behind us the great history of a great people. We don't want to be like those John Does, ancestry unknown.

There is a pressing need for good new textbooks in which the history of the fatherland is seen to live in the individuals who made it, in their quests, their struggle, and their passions. There is a great need also for books about and studies on our past, combining the qualities of artistic and popular scientific literature, free from ponderous pseudolearning and from cheap sensationalism.

This will be aided, in particular, by the journal *RODINA*, a publication of *PRAVDA* which will contain historical documents and literary works with a patriotic resonance.

History teaches. It teaches everyone a great deal. As for young people, they must learn one of the most vital historical lessons—the fact that it is from the older generations that they take over devotion to socialism and its outstanding gains.

In contrast to this, some people are arbitrarily endeavoring to present our path as a series of errors and crimes and are ignoring the great achievements of the past and present. Getting hysterical about the historical legacy of the Soviet era, they even go so far as to say that we have apparently built the wrong socialism, ascribing servility to Soviet people and trying to pass judgment on the giants of Soviet culture. They do all this under the guise of glasnost. It is a disgraceful business.

It is our duty, our obligation to uphold the honor and dignity of the pioneers of socialism. It is the task of our educational system to comprehensively strengthen the continuity of generations of the Soviet people and kindle in students a desire to augment the historical experience of the fighters for socialism. It has to raise people of courage, people with a highly developed sense of their revolutionary pedigree, their fatherland, their social system.

In the conditions of the increasing pace of economic reform, schools, vocational, PTU and VUZs must certainly pay the requisite attention to questions of the basic economic training of students. The development of cost accounting, various forms of cooperation, and collective and family contracts—all this requires substantial changes in the social mentality which for a long time, from the school bench, had adopted an incorrect attitude toward the very concepts of income, profit, and personal material interest. Education is meant to be the barrier to such economic nihilism.

But, at the same time, we are faced with another, seemingly opposite but, in fact, closely related task: Ensuring that money-grubbing ambition, the cult of gain, and individualism do not seep into the minds of young people. Education has a good medicine, one that has proved effective through the ages: moral education, exposing students to spiritual values. V.I. Lenin noted that "you do not get far on literacy alone. We need massive improvement in culture" (op. cit., vol 44, p 170).

In this area, to be frank, there are many gaps and omissions. For example, reading standards have been gradually dropping. This is particularly noticeable in young people. From early on it is necessary to cultivate a taste for serious reading, the need to see a book not as a domestic status symbol but as a treasure house of the human spirit.

Aesthetic education remains fairly neglected. This is a significant factor in the current immoderate thirst for "mass culture" which has no foundation in the people and is ideologically sterile and aesthetically vapid.

For example, some cite the needs of an allegedly separate youth culture in an attempt to justify the spread of primitive music. There are those who say that all "vagues" must be given their head. Loud groups are not the whole of the problem, of course. It is worrying to see the classics and whole strata of genuine, folk art taking a back seat.

Georgia and some other union republics are examples of the preservation and development of the traditions of folk music and its dissemination among young people, which cannot be said of some Russian oblasts, and particularly Moscow.

The aesthetic education of young people is a matter for the school, for the family. But not only them. It is a matter for the creative unions of the artistic intelligentsia and cultural institutions. Literary and art figures, including those who create works for children and young people, enjoy the great trust of our society and have a profound impact on people's minds and feelings. Hence their great responsibility for young people's futures. Literature and art must strengthen our young people's faith in the justice of the cause of socialism and be a source of inspiration.

It is very important today to ensure better aesthetic training for teachers and parents themselves and ensure the unification of all the forces engaged in the instruction of children and adolescents, overcoming departmental barriers between schools and cultural institutions and comprehensively developing children's and young people's artistic activity on the basis of Soviet and world classics and folk art. Then our young people, brought up on true values, will themselves refuse to consume substitutes.

All this forms a most important part of the enormous amount of work the party is undertaking to comprehensively develop the culture of Soviet society, strengthen its genuinely folk foundation, and enrich it with socialist content.

Comrades! Soviet youth is growing up in a multinational country. It is also growing up in a world of closely interwoven human interests, but one that is also torn by contradictions. Two indivisible educational tasks arise in these conditions: training both patriots and internationalists.

In the classrooms, at Pioneer gatherings, and, later, in training workshops and student halls the younger generation becomes involved with the traditions and values of the Soviet homeland, the spiritual make-up and culture of the peoples, the activities and preoccupations of the country, and its reputation in the modern world. It is the

duty of school and institute to instill in a graduate the qualities of a genuine—that is, active—patriot and internationalist. Being a patriot and internationalist means striving might and main for the success of restructuring. The basic fact is that the implementation of the transformations outlined by the CPSU Program and the raising of Soviet society to a new qualitative level are our international duty.

The academic year begins in Soviet schools, as is known, with the Lesson of Peace. This fact emphasizes the intention to raise young people who are loyal to the ideals of a world that knows neither wars nor weapons. Today a multitude of Soviet schoolchildren and students are themselves acting as "ambassadors of peace"—developing ties and personal contacts with their foreign coevals, thus making their own contribution to mutual understanding and cooperation among the peoples.

A start has now been made in real disarmament. But this is only the first step. The hatchet of war still threatens mankind. Our country still features as a target on imperialism's strategic maps. In these conditions Soviet youth's patriotism is inconceivable without awareness of the sacred duty to be loyal defenders of their fatherland.

We are doing a great deal in the field of military-patriotic education. But we should think about improving this work, particularly about enhancing the prestige of military training establishments and the officer's profession. It would be a good idea also to set about improving the quality and equipment for basic military training. An all-union rally of combat-trained young reservists was held on the initiative of the Komsomol Central Committee. This kind of initiative deserves every support. When young people who have had military training or have even had a baptism of fire go back to school or to youth collectives in general, it creates an atmosphere conducive to instilling in young people a readiness to defend the socialist homeland. This opportunity must be exploited to the full.

The most prominent of socialism's gains that a Soviet patriot always treasures and that he regards as his absolute duty to protect and strengthen is friendship among our country's peoples. Schools have done and are doing a great deal for the international cohesion of Soviet people by instilling in them literally from childhood feelings of unity, equality, and fraternity.

Nonetheless we must not become complacent. The West is gambling on the revival of nationalist manifestations. Institutions in the educational system must not come under the influence of the common, serene notion that there are no problems when it comes to interethnic relations.

Certain obvious omissions are worrisome. For example, exchanges of specialists with training at higher and secondary specialized educational establishments in various republics is poorly developed. This creates a degree

of national isolation of cadres and conflicts with the principles of our nationalities policy and the international nature of Soviet society. A more resolute effort must be made to develop the cooperative training of specialists. The current 5-year plan envisages admitting 2,300 people to VUZs on the basis of collaboration between republics (in the 11th 5-Year Plan the figures was 1,800). This is not enough, of course, and a way must be found to further develop cooperation.

Positive experience has been gained in this work through the expansion of interrepublican cooperation in the training of skilled workers. Over the last 5 years vocational and technical schools in the RSFSR, the Ukraine and Belorussia have admitted more than 40,000 students from the Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics. This practice not only helps to solve the cadres problem but also—and this is particularly important—further our young people's international education. It must be comprehensively expanded.

The development of Russian-national language bilingualism demands constant attention. Teaching in our country is conducted in 39 languages spoken by the peoples of the USSR. Concern for the native language, for its development, and for its interaction with the Russian language is a natural phenomenon. Every language is an inalienable part of our common wealth.

Unfortunately, party and soviet authorities in some regions lack realism, flexibility, and at times even political perception concerning such questions. An abnormal situation has developed in particular in Bashkiria, where schools offering teaching in the Tatar language were closed down to start with, followed by the closure of schools offering teaching in the other local languages. We must now correct this situation.

Another aspect of the problem involves the fact that some young people of non-Russian nationality have inadequate knowledge of the Russian language, the language of international communication and rapprochement. The Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the Ministry of Education lack persistence and long-term vision along this avenue. To see this you need look no further than their miscalculation in planning the required number of Russian language tutors, of whom there is a shortage of almost 4,500 in schools offering teaching in non-Russian languages.

There is no room for any privileges or restrictions, let alone compulsion, in the matter of language. Repudiation of voluntary principles when parents have to choose the language in which their children are to be taught would entail the violation of democratic principles in the nationalities question. Nor should legitimate love for one's native language be allowed to evolve into linguistic chauvinism. On the other hand, it is necessary to encourage by all means the study of local national languages by members of other nationalities who are permanent residents in other republics. People must more frequently



recall Lenin's behest that the cause of internationalism and brotherhood among peoples is best served by the practice of tuition in the Russian and native languages, not in different schools but in one common school. This is also well served by the joint upbringing of children of different nationalities in children's preschool institutions.

The party must set the tone in all educational work, not limiting itself to issuing calls for its improvement but giving proper guidance and helping to improve its quality. Of course we, as a political party, do not intend to regulate dress fashions or prescribe musical rhythms. But because we are a political party we must and will uphold certain world-outlook, moral, and aesthetic principles in conformity with our communist ideas of the proper image of a citizen of the Soviet socialist society. By approaching this work in a proper party fashion we must educate precisely such citizens through our own actions, through the power of example, and through the schools, the labor collectives, and the Komsomol.

We will not achieve much merely by issuing general appeals for improvement. It is necessary to show in detail how matters will improve and how such improvement is to be achieved. Hence the obvious conclusion: The summing up and mastery of positive experience of restructuring now constitute one of the most topical tasks of practical work on transformation and education.

We ourselves must clearly perceive and reveal to young people the ideal of the Soviet man which is already attainable now, on the eve of the 21st century. An ideal, moreover, which is not abstract but living, existing in reality, an ideal of flesh and blood, an ideal embodied not just in isolated individuals but in the vast number of Soviet people. This ideal man is a fighter for everything new and progressive. He is an impassioned champion of social justice, patriot and internationalist and genuine collectivist, someone who appreciates the great achievements of our own and the world's culture, someone who is concerned with social affairs. He is a man with a keen sense of civic responsibility, a true comrade, honest, decent, and friendly.

Today's student must become such a person. Tomorrow he will have to start living not as a faceless individual but as a personality that is spiritually and physically strong and prepared to participate in the competition of minds and talents, a personality free from the mentality of consumerism and philistinism; not a technocrat but a highly cultured person with broad horizons; not an appendage of today's mighty technology but its master; and of course, not a "small man" but a powerful master of life.

We must under no circumstances allow young people, like the older generation, to experience the destructive effect of drunkenness and alcoholism. In this context it is very important to consolidate and develop everything valuable that we have already gained in the struggle for a sober way of life.

Comrades, we are entitled to demand and expect much from the Soviet public education system along all avenues of educational work. As regards party organizations and party committees, their task is unambiguous: They will always be responsible for the way schools teach, and doubly responsible for the way they educate. This is natural, for it is the party that is ultimately and totally responsible for the ideological maturity, political awareness, and moral health of the people.

#### **To Strengthen the Party's Organizational and Cadre Work in Education**

The way a young person is going to turn out once he has left his school or VUZ is determined to an enormous extent by those who are responsible for his upbringing. It is determined by the character, level of knowledge, ideological commitment, and moral qualities of the teachers, lecturers, and heads of teacher collectives and educational establishments. This, as everyone must realize, makes considerable demands on party committees' cadre work.

The teacher and lecturer corps, more than 5 million people strong, is a wonderful attribute of ours. One in six schoolteachers, one in three staff members at technical colleges and vocational and technical schools, and almost half of all VUZ lecturers are members of the CPSU. In other words, 1.3 million communists are directly involved every day in dedicating their strength, their political experience, and their experience of life to the training of the younger generations.

The teacher and lecturer are key figures in the process of restructuring secondary and higher schools. But the lofty title of "teacher" only acquires its real meaning when it becomes inseparable from the concept of culture and morality. It is the level of culture and high moral standards that determine the teacher's character. The personal example set by the teacher leaves its mark on young people for the rest of their lives.

The vocation itself of teacher is inconceivable without selfless dedication, a total giving of oneself and nobility, which were always present in the great educators, such as Ushinskiy, Makarenko, Sukhomlinskiy, as many among today's innovative teachers, who have a keen sense for genuinely new ideas and the ability to look ahead and prepare their charges for their future life.

While in no way diminishing the role played by the teacher and his individual talent, it should be pointed out that the main strength of any educational establishment lies in the collective of like-minded teachers and students who are united by their common ideas and interests. Forming stable teacher collectives in schools and VUZs and creating a comfortable atmosphere in them for teachers, students, and parents and a climate of creativity and exigency are the most important task of party and Komsomol committees.

While noting teachers' decisive contribution to the process of restructuring higher and secondary schools, one cannot ignore indications that not all is well in the scholastic environment. Many teachers have low professional standards and have lost interest in increasing their knowledge. We come across instances where the teacher is tiresomely overbearing and even orders his students about, thereby lowering their self-esteem. Such behavior is intolerable. The prevailing atmosphere in educational establishments must be one of mutual respect and cooperation between teachers and students, principled conduct, exigency, comradeship, and responsiveness.

The practice everywhere must be to make greater demands on the quality of teaching work and decisively reject the policy of egalitarianism in the assessment and remuneration of teaching. The system of competitive selection of higher school professors and lecturers has now changed: Henceforth all positions will be announced as vacant every 5 years. The filling for these positions will be based on the opinion of the department and the students and on teaching results within the system of improving qualifications. In schools, vocational and technical schools, and technical colleges teachers and lecturers will periodically undergo certification, the results of which will determine their professional suitability, and salaries will be established on a differentiated basis. This system will be introduced in higher educational establishments starting with next year.

These all constitute serious levers by which to enhance the expertise and responsibility of teaching cadres. The task of party organizations is to ensure that these levers are used in conditions of openness and glasnost and contribute to establishing trust and businesslike, comradesly relations in collectives.

One of the most important tasks is to strengthen creative principles in teaching activity and support and encourage teachers' social activity. Schooling and education are only effective if the teacher does not simply see himself as someone carrying out instructions from above but as an equal and committed fighter for communist ideals. It is necessary to ensure that the practice of informing pedagogical workers on a broad range of topical issues concerning the party's domestic and foreign policy becomes an unshakable rule for party, soviet, and economic authorities and social organizations.

Present conditions make great demands on teachers. But they also demand that greater public concern be shown for them. Republic, kray, and oblast leaders should have no peace of mind once they are aware that 140,000 teachers are still without state or cooperative apartments. Surely it cannot be right that teachers' children are deprived of Pioneer camps, sanatoria, and nurseries? Teachers themselves are given passes to health resorts on an average of once every 35 years in their working lives! Trade unions and the AUCCTU have some work to do

in this respect. The party has set the task of decisively raising the teacher's social status and substantially improving his or her material and social position.

Documents on the reform envisage establishing an All-Union Pedagogical Society. Suggestions have been made in letters and in the press to form a national Union of Teachers. These seem to be reasonable suggestions. The final decision will obviously rest with the all-union teachers congress. But one thing is clear—the creative activity of teachers must be raised to a qualitatively new level.

Schools will not be able to have up-to-date teachers without radical changes being made in our pedagogical institutes. Of course, these changes will take some time, but the task of making a start must not be shelved. Bolder steps must be taken to create study-science-pedagogical complexes comprising pedagogical institutes, institutes for improving teaching skills, schools, and preschool institutions. Dissemination of the experience of the Poltava Pedagogical Institute, which has developed an efficient system of student selection and the cultivation of respect of the teaching profession, deserves broad support.

Universities are called upon to play a major role in raising the standards of scientific, pedagogical, and methodological training and retraining of teaching cadres.

We are still awaiting a practical solution to the question of training instructors for vocational and technical schools. The corps of these mentors is more than 200,000 strong, but there is an annual shortage of 14,000-16,000 openings in fully staffing such schools. The shortage of highly skilled workers among these experts is particularly noticeable. We must encourage the desire of skilled cadre workers to transfer from enterprises to work in vocational and technical schools. We must offer them material backing and moral support.

Concern for staffing schools, colleges, and VUZs with young teachers and lecturers must be the object of constant attention of educational establishments councils, their leaders, and their party organizations. Young people with an aptitude for teaching ought to be identified in good time while still in secondary or higher school. They must be helped with sound advice, and recommended to VUZs. We must guarantee them a place of work. Their production training and practice must be organized, and their teachers must be selected at an early stage—unless this is done, we will not achieve the proper renewal of secondary and higher education.

Briefly speaking, society's best intellectual forces, eminent scientists, cultural figures, and specialists from the national economy must be recruited for the teaching and instruction of secondary and higher school students.

Party committees must change their view of and approach toward the family and its responsibility for the upbringing, teaching, and behavior of children. The family and the school are natural allies. They are two mighty forces of upbringing. Uniting them would mean largely solving the problem of bringing up the growing generation.

The party and the state are showing constant concern for strengthening the family's material situation. Although numerous benefits have been introduced a critical analysis shows that some categories of families—especially families with many children, single-parent families, or newly married couples—are materially disadvantaged although it is they that most urgently need support.

At the same time, there is an obvious paradox: On the one hand, opportunities have considerably increased because of material prosperity and educated parents; on the other, families' participation in matters involving school affairs and their own children is not increasing and at times is even declining.

Of course, it is parents who are party members who must set a personal example. Keeping in touch with the school is not all that difficult. Parents must visit them, especially the fathers, and must help the teachers—in other words the gap between teachers and parents must be closed. Unfortunately, there is only a handful of raykoms that keep an eye on these issues. Systematic reports by party members on the upbringing of their children and the help they give to schools must become the norm within the party.

At the same time, party committees and local soviets must constantly help the family by organizing education studies for parents, boosting the prestige of close-knit and industrious families and labor dynasties, and propagandizing their experience in bringing up their children. The moral and material potential of labor collectives where the parents work must be more fully applied in solving all such problems.

Party organizations and the public, especially in regions where people have many children, must help families to make fuller use of the opportunities offered by preschool education. Surely it is not right when, for example, the share of children attending kindergartens and nurseries is only 13 percent in rural Turkmenia, 7 percent in Azerbaijan, and only 4 percent in Tajikistan. Generally speaking, the importance of preschool education is clearly underestimated in our country. It is all too often overlooked that this is an exceptionally important stage of public education which lays the initial foundations of the individual's personal qualities.

The recently established V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Foundation, the Institute of Childhood, and the weekly SEMYA are called upon to provide substantial assistance in strengthening ties between families and schools and organizing parents' general education.

In all matters involving the political leadership of school pupils' and students' collectives the party has good assistants in the **Komsomol, the Young Pioneers and Young Octobrists organizations.**

Today there are quite a few projects, ideas, useful and imaginative initiatives, and remarkable and unfading traditions among young people. To help their development and guide them along a path leading to results which bring joy to the young people themselves and meet the interests of society as a whole must be the object of proper concern by party organization leaders and aktiv members.

It is necessary, for example, for party committees to offer substantive and comprehensive assistance to the movement of student detachments. After all, about 800,000 VUZ and technical college students work in the construction industry, agriculture and the social sphere every summer. It is good that this movement is now going through a period of cleansing and development. Narrow-minded and selfish motivations are being resolutely eliminated from it. The best traditions of initiative and independence are being restored.

The 20th Komsomol Congress decisions were welcomed with gratification by the party and the elder generation of the Soviet people. We see that the Komsomol Central Committee is now striving to implement the instructions of congress delegates. But there are still quite a few zones of lethargy and passiveness on the unionwide map of Komsomol life. At the same time, there is clearly excessive youthful energy in places. Party and Komsomol committees at times fail to keep up with it. Yet it is their important task to promptly single out sound and useful initiatives from activity which emerges on an unhealthy foundation. It is not all that important to ensure that every single action is organizationally "subordinate" to the Komsomol. The important point is to ensure that Komsomol aktivs are at work there, acting as the pioneers and spirit of any sound initiative or movement. They must be given all-around party support and assistance.

The V.I. Lenin All-Union Pioneer Organization which, together with the Octobrists, rallies 33 million children, requires day-to-day party concern. In recent years difficulties, one could even say contradictions, have accumulated to some extent in its life. The Pioneer Organization has become more an organization for children than their own organization. A great deal must be done to overcome the shortcomings, and, in particular, active ties between communists and Komsomol members with Pioneers and Octobrists must be strengthened. State institutions and departments, the public, and personalities in literature and art must be directed to work actively with Pioneer collectives. At the same time it is necessary to improve the standard of ideological and vocational training of Pioneer leaders, of whom there are some 90,000 in the country, enhance their prestige in all school affairs, and improve their material position.



The main thing that must be achieved is to ensure that Pioneer affairs go hand in hand with the school reform, to renew the content of Pioneer work, to "update" it if you like, and make it attractive for children and useful for their development. This is up to the Komsomol, the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee, and the Central Council of the All-Union Pioneer Organization.

At one time it was the rule for party leaders to meet with children and young people. Now it is a rare exception. It would be a good thing to revive this tradition, to make leadership cadres aware of the need for constant contact with Pioneers and students.

Comrades!

Principle-mindedness is an essential requirement in cadre policy and the party leadership of the activities of educational establishments. Unfortunately not all party organizations meet this requirement. There are many which have failed to resist inertia, and sometimes favoritism, group partiality, and bribe-taking. This situation was encountered recently in a number of VUZ party organizations. The measures that the Party Control Committee and local party authorities had to adopt in such cases are sufficiently well known. Order is now being instilled. The republic communist party central committees and CPSU kraykoms and obkoms must truly help the communists at these VUZs to acquire the spirit of restructuring, principle-mindedness and party comradeship, and make wide use of the statutory right to monitor administration activities. Communists in higher education must resolutely eradicate adherence to obsolete form. Teaching and instruction, actively support innovation, and cultivate in the teachers and students a class approach to social phenomena. They must be militant champions of party decisions, rather than limping along in the wake of events, as sometimes happens.

Many party organizations of schools, vocational and technical colleges, and technical schools also need a much greater attention and efficient practical help. This must be the first and foremost concern of party raykoms and gorkoms. They can and must reach every school, every college and technical school, gain a thorough knowledge of their situation, and skillfully influence the promotion in the collective of a sound moral and psychological climate, an atmosphere of creativity and active support for leading teachers.

The realities of life are such that the party organization of any individual school will always be relatively small in numbers. In this context the CPSU raykoms and gorkoms should give thought to ensuring that party influence on school life is exercised not only through the efforts of the teachers who are party members themselves, but also those of party organizations at the base enterprises and

parents who are party members. And there is nothing preventing the raykom personnel themselves from becoming more frequently and thoroughly involved in such work.

In general, the question of the attitude of party raykoms, rayispolkoms, and economic organizations at the schools should be posed urgently. There is still much red tape and bureaucracy here. The real concerns and problems of the school and its workers and students are often discussed in accounts and reports, but that is all. For the bureaucrat, the people's fate, people's concerns do not exist. For him, what is important is not the dynamics of minds and souls, but the movement of things. Such people only remember the school or the vocational and technical college when the time for harvesting cotton or potatoes comes around. The local party and soviet workers regularly visit livestock units and machine operators. Yet a visit by the top leaders of the rayon, city, or oblast to the VUZ, school, vocational and technical college, or kindergarten is seen as nothing less than an extraordinary event. It is as rare as Christ appearing to the people.

Practically every day reports on milk yields and other economic matters are placed on the desks of raykom secretaries and rayispolkom leaders. Yet the entire many-faceted and complex life of the collectives of educational establishments, of which there are a good many in every rayon, is usually confined to the office of the raykom instructor for schools—and nothing more. Is this right?

Rayon soviets of people's deputies only rarely, and then mainly under pressure from above, examine questions of public education, and moreover fail to show the necessary persistence and tenacity in organizing the implementation of decisions.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo expects that the local party leadership will draw the right conclusions from the fact that all this has become the subject of a concerned discussion at a Central Committee plenum.

We have many cities and rayons where questions of party leadership of the schools are tackled competently and efficiently. A clear example is that of the Slonim party gorkom in Grodno Oblast. Here, both in the city and in the countryside, a material base has been created to ensure good conditions for the successful teaching, physical and aesthetic development, and labor training of the students. All the schools and vocational and technical colleges are fully staffed with cadres. The party gorkom, its departments, the buro members, and First Secretary Comrade V.P. Razinkevich are constantly involved with school problems. They meet with teachers who are party members, secretaries of the party organizations of educational establishments and base enterprises, students, and the Pioneer and Komsomol aktiv. Such high standard of educational and methodological

work yields good results in the training and educational process. The rayon's strong economic position and the growing successes in its social and cultural life are undoubtedly related to this.

Party organizations in secondary and higher education must actively promote the democratization of the educational establishments' life, the development in the collectives of an innovative approach, constructive glasnost, creative criticism and self-criticism, and the eradication of self-satisfaction and arrogance. The union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms must thoroughly analyze the composition and work of the educational establishments' party organizations, help them to improve their activity, and organize political studies for teaching personnel and briefings and instruction for them.

The practice of setting up branches of the universities of Marxism-Leninism at the VUZs has proved itself, and gives the VUZ aktiv the opportunity to acquire higher political education. Greater attention must be paid to the organizational strengthening of the party organizations of educational establishments and to replenishing them with fresh forces by selecting teachers and tutors for party membership, as well as politically mature and tempered students.

One important area of party leadership is the selection, placing, and education of cadres as leaders of educational establishments and organizers of public education. Here V.I. Lenin's instruction is always relevant: "the communist leader must prove his right to lead by the fact—and only by this fact—that he finds many, more and more, helpers among teaching practitioners, that he knows how to help them to work, to promote them, to display and take into account their experience" (op. cit., vol 42, p 325).

Of late there has been a significant renewal of leaders of educational establishments in the public education system. This means that thousands of principals of schools, colleges, and technical schools and rectors of institutes must now master the art of managing collectives of people who are both teaching and learning, moreover, in the exacting conditions of restructuring. It is very important for them to accumulate experience rapidly and acquire and establish in the collectives the spirit of innovation and constant quest. The attitude to real, not imaginary, innovation in teaching is the touchstone by which the leadership cadres of educational establishments and management organs are measured.

In some places principals of schools and vocational and technical colleges are being replaced at a rate of 20 percent a year. Here leaders are chosen by the trial and error method; people seem to think that the frequent replacement of cadres is virtually the only way of improving things, a damaging delusion. It is necessary constantly to work with leadership cadres, to spend time

on them, so to speak; to help them when necessary, to offer support, to train a reliable reserve and test it in practical work. It is necessary to relieve them of the inappropriate functions of economic activity and give them broader rights on questions of cadre certification, staff and financial discipline, and material and moral incentives for workers.

Party committees and the primary party organizations of educational establishments still have to really master the effective instrument of training the leadership personnel, the election of leaders and their periodical accountability to the collectives. Last year some 100 VUZ rectors and more than 1,000 principals of general educational and vocational and technical schools were appointed on the basis of elections in the collectives. The party committees must make fuller use of this democratic form of cadre work and rely more widely on the collective opinion so as to avoid errors and mistakes in the selection of leaders. This is a guarantee that they will march confidently and successfully in step with the growing changes in the country.

Comrades! Practical preparations are now under way for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. The party committee plenums and meetings which have been held, with reports by the leading organs, have demonstrated the communists' growing activeness and unswerving determination to bring all the party's activity into line with the tasks of the new stage of restructuring.

One such task is the need to solve the complex, large-scale problems facing our public education system. The party has always seen the enlightenment of the people and arming them with the cultural wealth developed by mankind as a most important condition for the success of all of its revolutionary transforming activities. The CPSU is promoting a program for radically improving matters of education and instruction and bringing Soviet schools up to the most advanced heights. Its implementation is a most important task for the entire party and the nation. (Sustained applause.)

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

**Plenum Resolution on Gorbachev Speech**  
*18020010d Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4,*  
*Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 87) p 67*

[Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 18 February 1988]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Plenum unanimously approves the provisions and conclusions contained in the speech by M.S. Gorbachev "Revolutionary Restructuring—Ideology of Renovation." The speech offers a profound analysis of the new stage of perestroika and sets forth the program for its ideological backup.

The plenum stresses that all ideological activities of the party organizations must be subordinated to mobilizing the working people and the labor collectives for tackling the main tasks of restructuring: carrying out the radical economic reform and the democratization of all social life and the education and upbringing of the growing generation of the toiling masses.

The plenum deems necessary a resolute renewal of the forms and methods of ideological and political education work and a firm assertion of social justice in conformity with the aims of the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society.

The plenum approves the provisions and assessments of foreign policy issues contained in M.S. Gorbachev's speech and points out the importance of explaining broadly the humanistic content and aims of the international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state directed at asserting the principles of equality and universal security in international relations.

The plenum instructs the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations to draw attention to the need for the activists and all communists to focus resolutely on the ideological content of perestroika, strengthening ties between the CPSU and the masses and ensuring a close interaction among soviet, trade union, Komsomol, economic bodies, ideological media and all cadres in the areas of the economy, social policy and spiritual life. All means of political work must be used so that perestroika may become the party cause of every party member and the patriotic duty of every citizen.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

### **On the Course of Perestroika in Secondary and Higher Schools and the Party's Tasks for its Implementation**

18020010e Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 68-76

[Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 18 February 1988]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee plenum stresses that the restructuring of general educational and vocational schools and of higher and secondary specialized education occupies a special place in the set of tasks which are being tackled by the party at the present historical stage. The purpose of the changes taking place is to ensure a new quality of teaching and instruction of young people, cadre training and enhancement of their skills, and thereby to create the necessary prerequisites for the acceleration of the socioeconomic and spiritual progress of Soviet society and the implementation of the tasks set by the 27th Congress.

1.

1. The CPSU Central Committee plenum notes that during the restructuring of the public education system the attention paid by the party, soviet and economic bodies and by public organizations to the problems of secondary and higher education has intensified. Certain positive changes are taking place in the content of education and in the labor training of students. The training of workers with a broad range of special skills is developing in the vocational and technical education system. The process of pooling efforts of higher education, science, and production is burgeoning. Appropriations for public education have increased.

2. Nonetheless the CPSU Central Committee believes that the extent and pace of transformations in secondary and higher education do not meet the needs of society at the new stage of restructuring. In important fields, such as the improvement of teaching and instruction methods, available technical equipment, the management of the study and instruction process and teacher training, improvements have been insignificant so far. Advanced pedagogical experience is not being adequately disseminated.

The guidelines for reform drawn up prior to the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum were not underpinned by measures for the democratization of the public education system. Teachers, parents, broad circles of the public, and labor collectives did not become properly involved in its implementation. During the reform the activity of educational establishments was geared to satisfying the manpower requirements of the national economy which was developing on an extensive basis. Problems and difficulties arose in the practice of combining general education with vocational training both in the schools and the vocational and technical education systems.

Organizational work for implementing the reform is inadequate. The USSR Ministry of Education, the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education and the local public education bodies are displaying passivity and sluggishness in tackling pressing problems of the development of education. Aid to teachers frequently boils down to general guidelines and petty regimentation. The USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education is only feebly engaged in the restructuring of higher and secondary specialized education. The local party committees and soviet and economic authorities are not paying the necessary attention to tackling questions of public education. The residual approach to the needs of education and of educational establishments on the part of many sectorial ministries and departments is being overcome too slowly.

3. The CPSU Central Committee is setting to party and state bodies and public organizations the task of ensuring an abrupt turnaround in the restructuring of public education in accordance with the decisions of the 27th



Party Congress, and the provisions of the CPSU Program. As one of the decisive factors of economic and social progress, and a powerful means of preserving and developing the spiritual resources accumulated by mankind and handing them down from generation to generation, education must be a priority in state policy.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum proceeds from the premise that the teacher or educator is the decisive figure in the restructuring of the entire educational system. The success of the scheduled changes depends to a decisive degree on his knowledge, education skill and his active, convinced and passionate stance. The duty of the party and soviet organs is to change attitudes toward the teacher radically, resolutely, and without delay or hesitation, to free him of petty tutelage, to lift from him the burden of duties which have nothing to do with a teacher's work, to support creative and innovative quest, and to make as much time as possible available for the main thing—the teaching and upbringing of students.

## II.

1. The CPSU Central Committee Plenum deems it expedient to make changes in the guidelines on education reform, with a view to the following:

Shaping and implementation of the concept of universal secondary education of young people as a basis for the subsequent training of cadres of skilled workers and specialists and for the all-around development of the individual;

Large-scale technical re-equipping of the general educational, vocational and higher schools, and the use of scientifically substantiated standards in planning the development of public education, beginning with the 13th 5-Year Plan;

Elimination of departmental barriers and pursuit of an integrated state policy in public education, the firm interaction among all types of educational establishments and scientific and production collectives;

Democratization of public education in every way and the enhancement of the independence and responsibility of school faculties;

Conversion of the system of training and retraining education cadres, and radical improvement of scientific research in public education.

In the vocational and secondary specialized schools the training of workers and specialists should be developed primarily on the basis of secondary education, preserving the opportunity for young people to acquire vocational training with incomplete secondary education. In the general education school instruction in worker skills should be carried out according to the wishes of students and parents and commensurate with available facilities.

2. The conversion to universal secondary education of young people has radically altered the social role of general education schools in society and has sharply increased their responsibility for the efficiency of training and instruction, and formulated demand that the Leninist principles of the socialist school as an integrated polytechnical education for labor be given a modern content.

The CPSU Central Committee attaches fundamental significance to the fact that our integrated education should give all its graduates full secondary training and open up equal opportunities before them. The unity of the aims and tasks of education must be organically combined with the diversity of the schools, the flexibility of educational programs and curricula, and based on advanced education practices and innovative methods of training and instruction.

Paramount attention must be paid to developing students' individual capabilities and expanding differentiated training according to their needs and inclinations. The network of specialized schools and classes for more extensive study of various topics must be developed.

The schools must promote students' active involvement in productive work and in the system of social labor relationships and to instill in them a variety of work habits. Students' jobs must have a purpose, a connection with life's real needs, a usefulness to society and the family, and a potential for providing knowledge and pleasure.

The polytechnical aspect in schools must be consistently intensified, basic notions about the new technologies must be taught, together with up-to-date economic, legal, and ecological knowledge. We must ensure that secondary education standards are kept constantly in line with the demand of scientific-technical and spiritual progress. The setting up of a ramified state youth vocational guidance service must be accelerated, with the general education schools acting as an important element in it.

General educational, labor, cultural and moral training in schools is meant to help young people choose a profession, an area of work, and avenues of continuing education consciously, with societal requirements in mind, and to take an active part in social and political life.

3. Ensuring a high quality of vocational and general education training for worker cadres and the growth of political and civic awareness among young recruits to the working class is a most important prerequisite for accelerated social and economic development. The vocational-technical education system and the national economic sectors' production training network must focus on resolving this important task. Vocational-technical schools linked to base enterprises as well as specialized intersectorial schools capable of turning out workers trained in the skilled and integrated professions must be

developed even further. Everything must be done to broaden the practice of training and retraining worker cadres under contracts with associations and enterprises. State monitoring of the quality of training worker cadres in all forms of vocational schooling must be stepped up.

4. It is incumbent on party, state and economic agencies and social organizations to boost efforts on restructuring higher and secondary specialized education. The CPSU Central Committee plenum emphasizes that the outlined program of reforms must be implemented comprehensively. The tasks of radically improving the quality of specialists' training, utilizing them sensibly in the national economy, and further developing scientific research must be resolved on the basis of strengthening the ties between higher education and production and practice. Therefore:

A flexible system for cadre training must be established, such as to meet societal requirements for specialists in different areas in a timely way and in accordance with the demands of scientific and technical progress, the radical reform of the economy, democratization and the development of self-management. The quality of specialist training in all educational establishments must be improved, and VUZs which are weak in terms of cadres and material and technical facilities must be strengthened or, if necessary, reformed as extensions of leading universities and institutes;

Efficient forms for integrating higher education with production and science must be energetically introduced and the organizational-economic mechanism for collaboration between higher education and national economic sectors improved; VUZ and enterprise combined teaching, science, and production complexes must be set up, and dual-jurisdiction scientific research institutes and laboratories established (by the academies of sciences and the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education). Contractual relationships must be developed between VUZs and enterprises and associations, providing for the possibility of sending graduates to work on the basis of direct contracts between VUZs and enterprises;

Higher education experts must substantially increase their contribution to work on problems of national importance. In the formulation of concepts for the USSR's economic and social development for the 1991-2005 period, the USSR Gosplan and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the USSR Academy of Sciences, must make provision for an increase in the share of state appropriations for the development of scientific research in higher education.

The USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the sectorial ministries and departments have the task of raising secondary specialized

education to a qualitatively new standard and introducing timely changes into the structure and content of cadre training and into the forms of organizing the teaching and training process. The activity of these educational establishments must be oriented more fully toward training people to act as organizers of primary labor collectives and specialists in the latest technological areas.

5. The CPSU Central Committee plenum instructs ministries, departments and party organizations to pay particular attention to implementing the measures drafted by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on setting up a state system for additional cadre training and retraining. The organization of a corresponding network of educational establishments must be completed, making maximum use of the potential of higher and secondary specialized education and vocational-technical schools and doing everything possible to develop different forms of mass teaching in production.

6. The USSR Council of Ministers is assigned the task, with the discussion at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in mind, of submitting proposals for amendments and additions to the previously adopted documents concerning the reform of general and vocational-technical education and the restructuring of higher and secondary specialized education.

### III.

1. The CPSU Central Committee plenum is issuing the practical task of implementing the 27th CPSU Congress' strategic directive on creating a system of continuous education, which would encompass all components of instruction—preschool and adult educational institutions, general education and vocational-technical schools, higher and secondary specialized educational establishments, and the system for improving cadre qualifications and their retraining. Self-education must become an inner requirement, an everyday matter for everyone, and an inalienable part of the Soviet way of life.

It is important to give everyone the opportunity to constantly upgrade their knowledge through various forms of training, including extension studies, the system of political and economic studies, people's universities, and various courses and lectures. To that end it is necessary to make more active use of the mass media, particularly television and book publishing. The desire to master knowledge and grow spiritually must be extensively encouraged and be given public and state recognition.

2. The fuller implementation of the Leninist principles of the organization of schooling and the creation of a modern democratic structure for administering public education are decisive prerequisites for accelerating the restructuring of secondary and higher education.

To that end we must extensively develop self-management initiative, make educational establishments independent, give them the rights they must have in this respect, and increase their responsibility for high-quality training and upbringing of the younger generation. At schools and vocational and technical colleges it would be expedient to set up social councils in which students, labor collectives, social organizations and parents would be widely represented along with teaching personnel. Collective and democratic forms should be developed in the administration of higher and secondary specialized educational establishments. The principle that the leaders of educational establishments and their main subunits should be elected and made accountable must be consistently implemented.

The creation of state and public authorities to administer education under the soviets in rayons and cities—public education councils elected at conferences—shall be deemed expedient. Their concern will be to support and disseminate frontranking experience in training and instruction, to develop universal teacher-training education, and to take steps to improve facilities in educational establishments.

Collaboration among all public education components should be stepped up and a policy of creating the conditions for amalgamating their administrative organs should be pursued.

The role and responsibility of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in providing scientific back-up for the restructuring of public education is to be stepped up. It must be reorganized and made interdepartmental, with scholars focusing their efforts on the comprehensive elaboration of urgent problems of molding the individual, continuous education, and communist instruction.

3. The CPSU Central Committee plenum stresses the need to implement major steps to strengthen the material and technical base of public education and to ensure its technical modernization.

More funds must be channeled into its development in order to ensure the complete satisfaction of the requirement for preschool institutions; conversion to schools functioning mainly on the basis of single-shift classes; providing the conditions needed for the fruitful work of education VUZs and institutes offering refresher courses for teachers; establishing in every rayon and city adult education centers; substantially strengthening the material base of higher, secondary specialized, and vocational schools; and improving the social and living conditions of teachers and students. The USSR Gosplan, USSR ministries and departments, and union republic councils of ministers shall set specific timetables for resolving these tasks for each republic and region.

Large-scale measures for re-equipping educational establishments are to be implemented. The development and expansion of the production of modern technical teaching aids in line with world standards, teaching and scientific training equipment, instruments and toys in both the public education system and in sectors of the national economy are envisaged. The development of modern plans for educational and training establishments is to be accelerated and the conversion to construction based on these plans is to be based on a tight schedule.

It is necessary radically to improve the drafting and publication of textbooks, teaching manuals, and teacher-training literature. The need for such items of students, teachers and parents must be fully met and additional printing of textbooks for free sale must be organized.

#### IV.

1. The CPSU Central Committee plenum regards it as a very important task of party, soviet, and public organizations and teaching faculties to step up the communist education of student youth and mold their consciousness in the spirit of restructuring. The ever-present task is that of inculcating dialectical thinking in young people, and instilling in students and schoolchildren an "integrated revolutionary world-outlook" (V.I. Lenin), based on unity between the party's theoretical and practical activity in renewing all spheres of society's life. It is necessary to provide a thorough and intelligible demonstration of the wealth of ideas contained in the decisions and materials of the 27th Party Congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums, in Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues," and in his speech at the present plenum. It is necessary to convincingly demonstrate the continuity of generations, explain the unbreakable link between the transformations taking place in the country and the party's and the people's heroic gains, reveal our people's great past in a truthful and responsible way, and instill in young people a desire to add to the historical experience of the fighters for socialism.

The entire practice of teaching social science disciplines must develop a capacity for independent judgment and help students consciously to master the scientific conclusions reflecting the dialectics of life. It is necessary to instill in young people a high degree of ideological commitment, scientific materialist views, and the ability to assess social phenomena from clear-cut class positions.

2. Through their entire work schools are meant to cultivate a labor way of life and enhance the prestige and instructional role of the main job of students, which is to study. It is necessary to establish in every educational establishment an atmosphere of hard academic work and a committed, creative, and responsible attitude to the acquisition of knowledge. As well as becoming more exacting, it is necessary to intensify in every way the



incentives for outstanding study, encourage young people to participate in creative scientific and scientific-technical activity, and make the forms of this work more varied. The CPSU Central Committee regards it as intolerable for university and secondary-school students to be diverted during study time to work on projects unrelated to the study process.

3. The young people must be taught through practical means how to live and function in conditions of deepening democracy. To this end it is necessary to create in educational establishments all necessary prerequisites for openness and glasnost, mutual respect and cooperation between teachers and students; to develop independence in students and provide them with broad opportunities for useful initiative and creativity. It is necessary to instill general, political, and legal culture and the culture of socialist democracy and ensure that young people have a thorough grasp of the constitutional rights and duties of the USSR citizen. It is necessary to organize universal legal instruction as a unified state-wide program covering all population strata and all cadres in the center and at the grass-roots level.

4. It is necessary to considerably intensify the patriotic and international education of young people. A sense of involvement in the traditions and values of the Soviet homeland and the great history of our multinational country and an awareness of the sacred duty of being loyal defenders of the fatherland are to be instilled from childhood. The entire atmosphere in educational establishments must be permeated with the spirit of internationalism, friendship and fraternity among the Soviet peoples.

A vigorous effort must be made actively to develop national-Russian bilingualism, fundamentally to improve the study and teaching of the languages of the peoples of the USSR and the Russian language, voluntarily adopted by Soviet people as a means of communication among nations, and to widen in schools the practice of joint teaching in Russian and in native languages. The study of the local national language by young people of other nationalities is to be encouraged. On the matter of the language of instruction, no privileges or restrictions or administrative meddling are permitted.

5. Attention must be stepped up to the molding of communist morality and the atheist education of the rising generation. It is necessary to foster in young people lofty spiritual needs, aesthetic tastes and the need for physical improvement.

With a view to stepping up the aesthetic instruction of children and young men and women and firmly immunizing them against spiritual aridity and the influence of bourgeois "mass culture," it is necessary to familiarize them thoroughly with the best achievements of world and domestic culture, to develop their artistic creativity in every possible way, and to skillfully and persistently

propagandize genuine folk art. The Komsomol, the trade unions and creative unions, the USSR Ministry of Culture, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, and the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting must join the schools in making this a matter for their concern.

In order extensively to involve young people in physical fitness and sports, the existing basic facilities at educational establishments, sports societies and enterprises must be strengthened and utilized more efficiently regardless of departmental affiliation, and the training of physical fitness cadres must be improved by pooling to this end the efforts of public education agencies, the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports, the AUCCTU, and the Komsomol Central Committee.

It is the urgent task of the CPSU Central Committee to enrich in every possible way educational work outside school hours at people's places of residence. The main thing here is to involve every child, teen-ager, or young person in special-interest classes and fill their spare time with technical and artistic creativity, sport or tourism. Constant attention must be paid to amateur youth associations, and the socially useful thrust of their activities must be promoted along with the satisfaction of young people's healthy interests and needs.

6. Party, soviet, and public organizations, labor collectives and society as a whole are called upon to show greater concern for the shaping of strong, morally healthy and spiritually rich families, for mothers, and for children, who are the country's future. It is necessary to increase parents' responsibility for children's education and for preparing them for life and work. Cooperation between families, schools and labor collectives must be intensified.

Particular attention should be paid to the system of preschool education as a most important step in the formation of individuals which largely determines their subsequent development.

7. The CPSU Central Committee plenum instructs union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms resolutely to upgrade the standard of political leadership in the education and upbringing of children and young people, profoundly to examine the content of the work of educational establishments, and competently to solve problems in a businesslike way. The role of primary party organizations at educational establishments in implementing the restructuring of secondary and higher schools and in mobilizing the efforts of teaching and lecturing personnel and students to improve the quality of training and instruction must be increased. Concern must be shown for strengthening the primary party organizations at educational establishments.

Party raykoms and gorkoms, taking account of the low numbers of party organizations at schools, and technical colleges, must ensure the growth of the party's influence on the lives of their collectives not only through the efforts of teachers who are party members, but also through communist parents, party organizations at key enterprises and party raykom and gorkom personnel.

It is necessary fundamentally to improve the training of teacher cadres and to select for training at normal schools the best young people who have a yen for working with children and see that as their vocation. The expanding practice of electing the heads of educational establishments and providing job certification of teacher-training cadres increases the party committees' responsibility to nominate suitable people with the necessary political, professional and moral qualities for teaching work.

The party's entire ideological work must be such as actively to promote the successful restructuring of secondary and higher schools and the development of continuous education as a most important component in the integral process of molding the character of the Soviet people.

8. Improving the people's education and culture is the paramount concern of the Soviet system and its central and local bodies. The plenum stresses that soviets, with the backing of the general public, must act as the organizers of all work on providing general secondary education for young people, vocational guidance and training, and job placement; strengthening and developing the material base of educational establishments and preschool and extramural institutions; providing them with full cadre staffs; and improving teachers' working, general living, and leisure-time conditions.

9. The Komsomol must see restructuring education, instilling in young people a desire for knowledge and professional expertise, and shaping their communist morality and lofty civic duty of serving the homeland as a very important area of its activity. The work of Komsomol organizations must be geared to the all-around development of young people's creative instincts, a responsible attitude to the job in hand, and the satisfaction of their diverse interests and needs. It must combat consumerism and parasitism.

It is necessary to update the content of Pioneer work and make it attractive to children and beneficial to their development. The public and literary and artistic personalities are urged work actively with Pioneer collectives. The standard of ideological and vocational training of Pioneer leaders must be improved.

10. A full life for educational establishments and the successful solution of the comprehensive tasks of teaching and instructing young people are inconceivable without a committed attitude by the general public and all its organizations. The improvement of labor, general living,

and leisure conditions for teachers, educators, school-children and students is the paramount concern of trade unions. Their initiative on improving material facilities for artistic work and health and sports occupations deserves every support. The areas of education and instruction, where an unbroken link between the generations of Soviet people is ensured and where many tasks connected with strengthening the moral and political unity of society are being tackled, provide great opportunities for war and labor veterans' organizations, the All-Union "Znaniye" Society, the Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies, the societies of rationalizers and inventors, DOSAAF, creative unions, the Soviet Culture Foundation and others to make their mark. The Soviet V.I. Lenin Children's Foundation and women's councils should play a special part in all this comprehensive work.

11. The mass media have responsible tasks in connection with the intensification of the reform of public education. Television, radio and the press have to competently and authentically cover school life and the complex process of education and upbringing. It is important to enhance the role of the media in making public positive advances and difficulties in the restructuring of education, in enhancing the prestige of the teaching profession and its difficult and honorable labor, and in eradicating conservatism and dogmatism in organizing and managing public education.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum stresses that the party and society must constantly focus attention on people's education and the matter of teaching and instructing the younger generations and expresses firm confidence that party committees, state bodies, public organizations, Soviet teachers, professors and educators will do all their utmost to ensure the consistent implementation of the program guidelines of the 27th party congress and raise the public education system to a qualitatively new level.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

### **Energetically Promoting Perestroyka**

*18020010f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 77-84*

[Article by Valter Udam, first secretary of Pyarnuskiy Raykom, Estonian Communist Party, Hero of Socialist Labor]

[Text] Now, on the eve of the 19th CPSU Conference, I look back with increasing frequency at the past 40 years of Komsomol and party work, at the distance my country and I have covered. Every person has his own way of life. As it advances toward the common objective, each labor collective rayon or republic makes its own way, different in some ways from that of others. That is precisely the

way it should be although we are still reluctant to speak of this and frequently try to squeeze within a single mold all that is strictly ours, special and unique, that goes beyond the range of general statements and slogans.

However, if over a long period of time a person is denied the opportunity openly to express his opinion he withers away spiritually and soon has nothing to say any more. All that are left to him are various cliches which replace live thinking and speech, and the deep-seated habit of repeating ideas formulated by higher authorities. I cannot fail to think of the cruel irony of history which violated the rights of the individual and caused tremendous harm to the building of our socialist society. To me, linked as I am to fields and farms since childhood, the practical consequences of such violation become visible above all in the huge waiting lines at stores. And all of this is occurring on the threshold of the 21st century!

I well remember the period after the 20th CPSU Congress. At that time I was first secretary of Vyruskiy Raykom, Estonian Communist Party. It was with inspiration (this term, as applied to those years, would be no exaggeration) the people undertook to implement the resolutions of the 20th CPSU Congress. Party work became extremely interesting. The pace of positive changes was felt in each nerve cell. Unquestionably, at that time a number of hasty and erroneous decisions were made. However, the party retained its militant mood and enjoyed a feeling of authority among the people.

I disagree with the view that at that time it was impossible to do creative work although, naturally, many of the instructions which came from above harmed the cause and fettered the people's initiative. The worst part was related to corn growing. The authorities descended on the rayon and demanded that perennial grass fields be replowed and planted in corn. All of this occurred during the second half of May, when the spring sowing campaign had already ended. With this kind of agrotechnology no crop can yield any harvest. Naturally, the republic's leadership could have explained to the enthusiasts favoring the indiscriminate sowing of the "queen of the fields" that, given our climatic conditions, such a decision was inadmissible. However, a large number of them had become accustomed to blindly following the instructions issued by superiors and no longer used their heads. I was able to avoid this and to preserve perennial grass crops which, fortunately, in our areas, have never let livestock breeders down. All that those who had replowed their fields as ordered could cite as an excuse when milk production dropped was that there was no hay and a poor corn crop because of bad weather conditions....

Excesses in solving economic problems and violations of the standards of party life are to this day part of our reality. Efforts are being made to instill, in the guise of orders, the new ways and means of work which are being steadily developed. Unfortunately, neither the union nor

the republic leaderships of the agroindustrial complex have as yet abandoned this work style. They are confident, to this day, that one can see farther looking from a high tower forgetting, however, that the higher the observer is the more blurred the picture under his eyes becomes. It is high time to understand that a good project does not require coercion. It always makes its way without excessive noise and fuss.

In January 1970 I was made first secretary of Vilyandiski Raykom. Thus, after almost 6 years of work within the apparatus of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, once again I found myself in my own element. It was I. Kebin himself, at that time Central Committee first secretary, who drove me to Vilyandi himself and, after a few words of advice, returned to Tallin. Meanwhile, I faced the members of the raykom buro with whom I exchanged initial impressions. At the plenum, I. Kebin had said, repeating this later to the members of the buro, that the rayon must surmount the stagnation and that here people were working at below-capacity level. Although no one had objected, it was clearly felt that many members of the aktiv considered this assessment of their work unfair. Many weeks had to pass before we were able to make a self-critical and businesslike analysis of the situation.

The Estonian peasant is a calm person, hard to move. He reacts to new developments unwillingly and with a great deal of caution. However, if he realizes that the project is worthwhile he works conscientiously, with total dedication. I was able to realize this once again when we undertook to organize a new production management system.

I do not consider it right when a person who has no concept of the responsibility he assumes is promoted to a position of leadership in the rayon party organization. Unfortunately, such promotions are quite frequent. I am convinced that the party organization in an agricultural rayon must be headed by a hereditary peasant, someone with peasant blood in his veins. Frequently a city dweller fails to find a common language with the rural workers, which causes irreparable harm to party work. If the rayon population does not accept the secretary as one of its own, he may as well not unpack his suitcase. The best choice is to find a skillful head of the party organization among the locals, a person whom everyone has seen grow up and mature.

I unpacked my suitcases immediately upon arrival in Vilyandi and my family joined me soon afterwards. I had the feeling of coming home. I do not understand colleagues who go to a rayon to work as though on an assignment, considering the position of first raykom secretary as no more than the next step in their career. A closer look shows that the activities of such a secretary, even if he personally believes them to be successful, constitute a major misfortune for the rayon and its population.



A turn took place in farm management after all lagging farms were strengthened with cadres. The rayon had a successful 9th 5-year period. However, indications during the second half of that period already were that the high growth rates of output could not be maintained with the old methods during the new 5-year period. The relatively high level of output demanded the democratization of management and strengthening cost accounting principles. The need for production specialization and concentration led the rayon to the creation of agricultural associations.

At that time concentration and specialization in other republics were being departmentalized. Associations, trusts and various councils were set up separately for sovkhozes and kolkhozes. Our republic petitioned for the creation of a territorial agricultural association. Under the conditions of our republic the separation of kolkhozes from sovkhozes and neglect of the territorial principle in the creation of associations seemed unjustified to both scientists and practical workers. Eventually this viewpoint was accepted.

The decision was made to begin with experimenting in a single rayon. We suggested Vilyandiskiy Rayon and it was thus that in September 1975 that the Vilyandi Agricultural Association was born. In addition to kolkhozes and sovkhozes it included enterprises servicing agricultural production and those processing agricultural commodities. The association encompassed the virtually entire rayon production potential. The agricultural administration was terminated as an agency of administrative management. All rights in terms of organizing production and purchasing and processing commodities were assigned to the rayon association which included the rayon Estselkhoztekhnika organization. We passed a provisional regulation on the association. Its creation marked a conversion from economic management based on orders to cost accounting.

The raykom, which headed the reorganization of production activities, paid the closest possible attention to political education. In this case feedback is invaluable. The rayon has the real opportunity of being in daily contact with the labor collectives. The working person is not shy in expressing himself openly concerning our work and the level of party leadership. The party manager must find a common language with the people. Naturally, anyone who travels around the area with an arrogant expression on his face would see and hear nothing. To our shame, there are some such party workers. Hence decisions which prove to be alienated from reality are made. During the period of stagnation the higher echelons had gradually alienated themselves from real life. On the rayon level we could not allow ourselves such luxury. The comprehensive plans for the economic and social development of the farms called for systematic production specialization and concentration. We simply had neither the resources nor the manpower for small-scale isolated production. I still consider this trend absolutely correct, although some large farms are

"segmented." The point is that in some cases managers and specialists blindly followed the engineering solution, which is superficially tempting, forgetting that agricultural production is a comprehensive phenomenon. The planning organizations planned cumbersome projects which also suited the construction workers. As a result, the farm manager, yielding to departmental pressure, would undertake to build a livestock farm larger than planned. In itself, however, the method of production concentration is justified. Under our circumstances the best farms are those capable of handling 460 milk cows. Currently we are surrounding the farms in Pyarnuskiy Rayon with small livestock farms which we lease to farmsteads. All of this, however, does not hinder a well organized large-scale production but can only add to it.

Production concentration and specialization contributed to upgrading labor productivity and to the efficient use of capital investments. Thus, labor productivity at the hog breeding complex with a capacity of 5,000 tons of pork annually, which was set up in 1976 at the Sovkhoz-Technical School imeni Gagarin, proved to be triple that of hog breeding in ordinary farms; its feed outlays per unit of output are lower as well. I mention this because it is being said now that the path which was chosen at that time for the development of agricultural production was faulty. It is claimed that family contracting should have been organized immediately, and land should have been leased the people instead of building large livestock farms. However, at that time the situation in the countryside was not what it is today. Young people were leaving for the city. The people were not attracted to the land. The small and undermechanized farms were simply short of personnel. The construction of large livestock farms and production concentration contributed to the retention of the manpower on the land. Farm income increased, which made it possible to raise wages and, above all, to invest more funds in the social reconstruction of the countryside.

In 1976 once again Vilyandiskiy Rayon was the winner in the republic socialist competition. In 1977 it exceeded the magic level by averaging 4,000 kilograms of milk per cow. In terms of this indicator we jumped from eighth in 1970 to second place in the republic. The high rate of increase in meat production attained in the previous 5-year period was retained. The creation of associations contributed to the comprehensive development of the rayon as a whole and to the equalization of production conditions and the restoration of social justice.

During the 3rd year of activities of our association the question of the future of this experiment arose. The republic's leadership decided that the entire Estonian territory would be converted to the new economic management conditions.

I was asked to pursue the experiment in Pyarnuskiy Rayon where the decision to set up a rayon agroindustrial association was made in January 1979. I was really sorry to leave Vilyandiskiy Rayon where I had worked for 9 years.

Family and friends were completely unable to understand such turns in my "career," for this was my fourth rayon, bearing in mind that at the beginning of the 1950s I had worked as first secretary of the Tartuskiy Komsomol Raykom. In the past the term soldier of the party had been popular. Yes, I am a soldier of my party, although I understand that this is not a job into which one is pushed. No one has ever pushed me anywhere: on each occasion I personally agreed to my new appointment. I shall not conceal that I like to work on the rayon level: here one is in permanent contact with the people, with labor collectives. The personnel on the rayon level are in the very thick of life. Every day we face specific problems and can clearly see the results of our activities.

Truth becomes fully apparent only if one is always among the people, sharing bread and destiny with them. In such a case one can look into the heart of a person and earn his trust. I have frequently experienced this. Firm success in party work is attainable only when the transparent and barely noticeable barrier which separates the collective from the leader, whatever his rank, disappears. Unfortunately, many senior workers show such a superficial attitude toward their work that they do not even suspect the existence of such a partition. The public and the labor collective develop their own opinion concerning managers, either as a result of contacts with them or on the basis of hearsay. The more close, frequent and direct such contacts are the more objective becomes the assessment and the greater becomes the opportunity for both sides to engage in successful cooperation. It was this kind of approach to the work that helped me to feel at home in Pyarnuskiy Rayon as well.

In the autumn of 1978 one half of the grain and potato crops perished from excessive moisture, for during the summer and the autumn precipitation was three times the normal level. We were virtually unable to plow and sow the winter crops. It was under such circumstances that preparation for the creation of an agroindustrial association were undertaken.

Let me emphasize that the creation of the RAPO took place in an atmosphere of extensive glasnost, based on the principle of voluntary participation. In my view, this was precisely one of the reasons for our subsequent successes. The rayon working people took to the new agricultural production management system. Unfortunately, however, later the application of the Vilyandi and Pyarnu experiments, both in the republic and beyond it, was made mandatory. This also distorted the base on which the Regulation on the Agroindustrial Association was passed. Given all this, it should come as no surprise that in some parts of our country the RAPO is, to say the least, unpopular. The RAPO model had been so extensively and thoroughly "issued" and restructured by omnipotent superior agencies and departments that we cannot recognize it as our own offspring. How can we now support and defend it? We could not even imagine in our sleep the present structure described as an agroindustrial association, as it is being applied throughout the

union and has become largely bureaucratized. Criticism of the shortcomings of the new system can be heard everywhere. It turns out that the partners of kolkhozes and sovkhozes—enterprises which process agricultural commodities and service agricultural production—are stubbornly refusing to obey the agroprom administration agencies and that the work of the agroprom suffers from a number of bureaucratic distortions.

The Pyarnu RAPO has been in operation for the past 9 years and there has never been a case of an enterprise ignoring a decision made by the RAPO council, trying to avoid it and to weasel out of assumed obligations. All farms, enterprises and organizations joined voluntarily the Pyarnuskiy Rayon Agroindustrial Association. The association's council makes its decisions on a democratic basis, by vote. Everyone has the right immediately to express objections and should such objections be legitimate they are, naturally, taken into consideration. But then, after something has been jointly resolved it must be carried out.

No difficulty exists if everyone joins in a common project. I recall how all the members of the recently created Pyarnuskiy RAPO participated in the spring sowing campaign in 1979, for which reason it was completed on time despite the difficult legacy of the 1978 autumn. The Estselkhoztekhnika mechanizers helped the weaker farms to cope with the spring field work. As early as 1979 we were able to repay some of our obligations in terms of the state purchasing plans, which had accumulated over the preceding 3 years. A good beginning is a prerequisite for success. The task set by the party raykom to the rayon working people was to develop a high pace of work. We relied on the fact that successes in the first year would inspire the people and would restore their confidence in their own forces. Such was the system we adopted. To a certain extent, we were also helped by the financial mechanism which had already begun to operate in the RAPO. We introduced a system of redistribution of differentiated payments in favor of farms working under more difficult conditions, with the idea that this will make the poor richer without impoverishing the rich.

In accordance with the Basic Regulation on the RAPO we set up centralized funds, based on the quality of the land, the natural fertility of the soil. Each farm started to make rental payments to a centralized RAPO fund, depending on the rating of its land, ranging from 2 to 8 rubles per hectare. Such an assessment seemed fair to all and triggered no objections. This principle, which is operating so successfully in our rayon, is being violated by the agroprom on a national scale. In collecting such funds it simply appropriates part of the profits of the stronger farms. Naturally, this approach triggers discontent and the reputation of the RAPO suffers.

In articles I wrote for the republic and the central press I tried to substantiate the principals of rate planning and prove the importance of redistribution of the differentiated payments as an important factor in stimulating the

economic thinking among cadres in our RAPO. I have written seven pamphlets (four of them in Russian), in which I have unfailingly discussed the procedure governing the setting up of association funds. I have frequently addressed all-union and regional practical science conferences where I have described the experience of the party's leadership in its establishment. It is sad to realize that the method of management by order is still used in our agriculture. The saddest of all is neglect of the democratic principle in RAPO activities and of the principles governing its planning, based on a consideration of resource potential. Today on a centralized basis the agroprom funds are set on the basis of arbitrarily determined amounts withheld from the profits earned by the labor collectives and production is planned on the basis of the achieved level. The result is a loss of agroprom reputation which has almost vanished. Virtually no one remembers that VASKHNIL's Presidium has repeatedly approved our experience and recommended it for widespread application. The first time this was done was as early as 1977, when the Vilyandiskiy Agricultural Association was the only one in Estonia and which also marked the beginning of many others. What other than bureaucratism could be the explanation for such an attitude toward a practically proven method for the development of economic relations within an agroindustrial complex?

The development of agricultural production must always remain the focal point of attention of the party raykom. The point is how to achieve this without taking over from the economic managers and how to interconnect all forms of party influence on the economy. The practical accomplishment of this is no easy matter. Whatever our circumstances, I believe that we were able to find ratios between economic and political work, which were right for our conditions, steadily improving and polishing the style of party work.

We relied mainly on the development of local initiative and undertaking. We strengthened the raykom cadres and the body of primary party organization secretaries. The training of leading cadres was undertaken on the basis of a specific program. Young managers replaced tired economic managers in four sovkhozes and two kolkhozes. Even during that period, today described as the period of stagnation, our entire efforts were concentrated on a single target: ensuring the further socioeconomic development of the rayon. I must point out that the pace of this development proved to be quite high.

In 1984, for the first time in its history, the rayon averaged 4,000 kilograms of milk per cow. Animal husbandry is our farms' main source of income. Progress in animal husbandry led to the fact that the profits of sovkhozes and kolkhozes have almost tripled after the establishment of the Pyarnuskiy RAPO.

Unquestionably, under more favorable circumstances the results of economic management would have been much greater. Excessive energy was required of managers on different levels in fighting bureaucratism, incompetence, favoritism, etc. Actually, everyone is quite well

familiar with the ills of the period of stagnation for me to have to repeat them. Let me merely add that the weak material and technical facilities hindered the growth of labor productivity. Incidentally, so far no particular changes have been made in this area. The quality of agricultural equipment is scandalously poor and the prices at which it is sold are fabulously high and are continuing to rise.

I am frequently asked what is it that helped the rayon surmount its lag and start moving. It would be difficult to single out any one of the complex set of factors which determine the results of party activities. Nonetheless, the main factor was probably the fact that we tried to work purposefully, with total dedication, relying on the RAPO which proved to be a successful means of combining the interests of enterprises and organizations, on the basis of the land. In working with the primary party organizations we always proceeded on the basis of the specific assignments set to the collective and the specific possibilities and features of the farms. The RAPO personnel helped farm specialists to formulate measures to upgrade production efficiency and, subsequently, to implement them. This, added to an efficient cadre policy, is the main factor. Let me re-emphasize that we paid particular attention to the lagging farms.

Some of them needed skilled cadres. Others had fallen behind for lack of an efficient program for the development of animal husbandry and crop growing, consistent with local conditions. Others again were short not only of specialists but, in general, of manpower, resources and many others. These required the most work but the raykom always began with a cadre program, and giving a lagging farm material assistance from RAPO funds. For such farms we allocated higher amounts of construction materials, fertilizers, equipment and mixed fodder. All of this, naturally, was achieved on a voluntary basis, in accordance with decisions made by the RAPO council, and within the limits of available funds. No outsider gave the rayon additional help.

We were warned that with such an economic policy pursued by the raykom, in all likelihood the weak farms would improve but the strong would stumble and, in turn, begin to fall behind. However, nothing of the sort occurred. All farms developed at a fast pace, which benefited the rayon at large. It is no secret that to this day scant state resources are being allocated to the weak farms. It is above all those which produce more that received and still receive more than the others and are given priority. Our way, however, seems to us preferable: it is precisely urging on the weak farms that contributes to the more efficient utilization of state capital investments and material resources. We set up the RAPO precisely for the sake of ensuring the accelerated development of all farms and not only the leading ones.

At the start of the 1980s, against the background of the relatively fast development of Pyarnuskiy Rayon, I felt particularly strongly the pressure generated by the



bureaucratic work style and the idle talk which was richly blossoming in the country. Naturally, it was not in my power to change things. Nor could I remain silent, however.

By that time the party raykom and I personally had developed close contacts with the theater in Pyarnu. Its actors actively participated in our projects. It was in cooperation with Ingo Normet, the theater's chief director, that I wrote my first play entitled "*Responsibility*." What inspired me to write it may have also been the fact that in my youth I had had training in a theater studio and all of these years I had felt that I owed something to the theater. The theater has made an unquestionable contribution to our struggle against the bureaucratization of economic management and idle talk instead of action. It had become the ally in party work and in the dissemination of party ideas. "*Responsibility*" was performed in three Estonian theaters and faced audiences 2 months prior to the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum. We are hearing today that plays of a publicistic nature have done their work. My opinion is entirely different. Contradictions are inherent in any age and today the bureaucrats are either quieter or have changed their clothing but in general a change in our way of life still lies ahead. Therefore, I intend to continue to cooperate with the theater.

Need we point out that the working people in our rayon unanimously approved and responded through action to the decisions of the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum? The question of perestroika, of improving the style and methods of work of party and soviet authorities and the RAPO apparatus was raised at the plenum of the the Pyarnuskiy Party Raykom and, subsequently, at meetings of the party and economic aktiv where the tasks set to the rayon under the new circumstances were discussed.

We did not wait for additional instructions from above and immediately went into action, for on the grass-roots level we can see more clearly available opportunities for further growth and how to apply them more easily and faster. The following task was set at the raykom conference: "Each department will find its proper place in the general movement, develop its own strategy and improve its work methods." A corresponding task was assigned to the rayon executive committee and the RAPO. I have always believed that the work style of the RAPO is a matter of prime significance, for economic activities are the foundations of social progress.

By that time we had already reached the conclusion that the role of science in the development of the agroindustrial complex must be enhanced. Experience convinced us that obsolete work methods and forms of extensive farming stop being profitable after a certain relatively high standard of production development has been reached. This originated the idea of setting up a RAPO scientific and technical council. Today the results of the 3 years of work of this council can be assessed positively.

It enabled us to make contacts with scientists regular and more extensive. The personnel of the republic's three scientific research institutes participate in the council's work. The council includes three doctors and nine candidates of sciences and RAPO and farm specialists noted for their labor accomplishments, or a total of 32 people. It is divided into six sections. It is precisely there that recommendations on the optimal development of the farms are formulated.

After the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the RAPO scientific and technical council began to issue an information sheet, a kind of mininewspaper entitled PROGRESS, which printed materials on crucial perestroika problems in the rayon. Contributors include scientists and practical workers who have achieved specific successes. PROGRESS has many friends and is unquestionably popular. It is important to note that the leadership of all useful initiatives of this kind is provided by the party raykom's agricultural department.

Concerned with upgrading the efficiency of the activities of the primary party organizations as the political nucleus of labor collectives, starting with 1986 we set up in the rayon "acceleration buros" or "development buros." What they actually do is the following: the most topical problems of farm development are considered and methods of solving them are earmarked at the expanded session of the buro of a primary party organization. Such meetings are prepared with the help of the raykom departments and RAPO specialists. Such buros are set up in organizations in which perestroika is developing more slowly than required. The common efforts invested in the development of the farm provide the necessary impetus for attaining the necessary acceleration. Positive changes which can be confidently credited to the "development buros" have taken place in the Sindi and Syade sovkhoses, the kolkhozes imeni V.I. Lenin and Massiaru and the Vyandra department of Estselkhoztekhnika.

This year a new curriculum has been applied for training personnel in the cadre reserve course sponsored by the raykom, and the number of students has been increased. The students are recruited among farm workers on a truly democratic basis. In addition to the work of our own lecturers teaching this course, we invite scientists and VUZ teachers from Tartu and Tallin. Some of them are also members of the Scientific and Technical RAPO Council, for which reason they are familiar with all rayon affairs. In turn, the rayon leading cadres upgrade their own skills and courses on the republic level.

In speaking of the future, I must mention that we have repeatedly requested that our RAPO be granted the status of experimental production association, so that we could make use without any outside interference of the entire agroindustrial potential of the rayon. We are not

asking for additional resources but instead pledge significantly to accelerate the pace of development of agricultural production in the rayon. This would benefit both the rayon and the state, and all of us would gain further experience.

To what does this apply specifically? Above all we would like to convert within the framework of the association our sovkhoses (there are 14 in the rayon) to the financial system used by the kolkhozes. Today the sovkhoses must operate within a stricter system and surmount a greater number of restrictions of different kinds. The RAPO is a state-cooperative enterprise and having a single financial-economic foundation for its activities seems entirely appropriate. We submitted this proposal 12 years ago, the day the Vilyandi Agricultural Association was formed, but are still waiting for a positive answer.

I am convinced that the competent union authorities should study this matter in depth. It is clear to everyone that the kolkhozes make use of their agro-economic potential much more economically and efficiently than the sovkhoses. However, we still encounter on different levels theoretical philosophizing to the effect that the state form of ownership is superior to the cooperative one and that the wheel of history cannot be reversed. Let us recall, however, that V.I. Lenin never pitted the state against the cooperative form of ownership and even less so tried to anticipate all the details and nuances of our future development and ways and means of socialist economic management.

In order energetically to pursue restructuring we must abandon dogmas and act daringly, keeping our sights on the immediate and long-term future. Life must be accepted as it truly is. Real social practice must become the only criterion of the accuracy of all of our theoretical elaborations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Democratization of the Party Means  
Democratization of Society; KOMMUNIST  
Roundtable Meeting by Correspondence**  
18020010g Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4,  
Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 85-88

[Text] With the publication of the letters which follow we are continuing our discussion on problems of party building and the further democratization of the party and society (see KOMMUNIST No 18, 1987; Nos 2 and 3, 1988).

A. Korovin, party organization secretary, Kurgan interurban telephone office: "Why is the Primary Party Organization Passive?"

We are familiar with Lenin's stipulation that the viability and combativeness of a political party are determined above all by the qualitative composition of its members. We also know that the primary party organization is the foundation of CPSU organizational structure. This makes our common concern for upgrading the activeness of the primary party unit understandable. Although we tirelessly discuss this topic, unfortunately we do little truly to strengthen the authority of the primary party organization and to make it the political nucleus of the labor collective.

We are hindered in such efforts by existing work stereotypes and a certain scorn for the fundamental principles of party building. We suffer from no shortage of resolutions which mandate the party organizations to accept in their ranks the best representatives of the people, those who embrace the CPSU program and statutes and are prepared actively to implement its policy. Nonetheless, the quality and structure of the party reinforcements leave, in my view, a great deal to be desired. This is confirmed by the passive attitude adopted by many primary party organizations.

Why is this happening? Naturally, it can be attributed to a variety of reasons. I shall name one which, on the surface, may seem strange: The party's ranks have become spoiled and the combativeness of its primary organizations is weakening, one of the reasons for this being the passive attitude of the workers who are party members. It is as though we are unwilling to see that they are in the majority. We are hypnotized by the title "worker," for which reason occasionally we spare no efforts to recruit into the party totally undeserving people. All of us must clearly realize that it is only truly progressive and politically active members of society and true fighters for perestroika and not simply non-drinkers and workers who meet their work quotas who must be recruited.

What is the actual situation? The raykoms try to increase the worker stratum and put pressure on us, primary party organization secretaries: "Secure the reinforcement of the party organization with workers." But how do the workers themselves look at this? Unfortunately, we are forced to admit that the attraction to join the party has somewhat abated among them in recent years. This can be largely explained by the fact that the period of stagnation, related to the degeneration of a certain segment of party cadres could not fail adversely to affect the authority if not of the party at large at least of some of its grass-roots organizations. "There is no one to emulate," is the frequent explanation given by workers for their refusal to join the ranks of the CPSU.

Meanwhile, let me repeat, the raykom is demanding of us, primary party organization secretaries, to ensure worker recruitment. So, in order to meet the "percentage requirement" we have been issued, we are willing to accept into the party any worker as long as he would agree to submit a petition. Naturally, it would be easy to accuse us of lack of principle-mindedness and call upon us decisively to improve our work in training party reinforcements. A sober assessment of the actual situation would be more difficult: the mechanistic and primarily statistical-bookkeeping approach to controlling the social structure of party ranks, which has become established in many party committees, ties our hands and feet and forces us to hasten the recruitment of workers in the party.

It is important, in my view, to consider another aspect of the problem: the one-sidedness in structuring the social composition of the party organizations. What do I mean by this? If a party organization is small, as is our case, and if it has a small number of workers, in the course of a given year it becomes possible to recruit one or two members of the working class, although the "norm" calls for three or four. And until the "norm" has been met (something which takes a number of years), we cannot recruit a single engineering and technical worker. The result is that our organization is composed essentially of workers and retirees, while those who define the nature of the labor collective and the enterprise, who teach political classes to the workers and who move scientific and technical progress are left outside the party. This weakens the party organization.

Naturally, we try to solve the problem: We hold open party meetings addressed, as a rule, by non-party engineers and managers. Honestly, however, is this a solution? For the reasons I named the party members, consisting essentially of workers, remain passive members of the organization. The question then becomes, who is the vanguard? The situation becomes absurd. It becomes much more difficult to grant party membership to someone who, only yesterday, was a worker but was able to earn an engineering degree from an institute without leaving his job.

These are not isolated cases. As a result of this we are losing some of the most combat-capable party reserves, consisting of frontranking members of the scientific and technical intelligentsia, such as physicians, educators or jurists, i.e., people who are needed for perestroika as much as frontranking workers. I suggest that the procedure for regulating the social composition of party ranks be revised and that stipulations which, in my view, are stupid and harmful be abolished. The sole principle which must govern us in this important matter is that party reinforcements must consist of the best representatives of our people, be they frontranking workers or engineers.

**V. Bobkov**, head of sector, Belorussian Communist Party Institute of Party History, doctor of historical sciences: "The Party Committees: Structure and Functions"

More than one generation of party workers have mentioned the need for acquiring full mastery of political management methods and no longer substituting for state, social and economic authorities. To this day, however, this problem not only remain topical but, in my opinion, has become aggravated to the extreme. The plenums held by the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the Vologda, Voronezh, Zaporozhye and Tambov party obkoms and many other party committees which discussed bureau reports on managing perestroika and solving this problem have linked it directly to that of streamlining party committee structure and personnel. Without undertaking to analyze all the reasons for substitutions and departmentalism in the work of party committees I suggest that we simply take a close look at their structural-personnel duplication tendency.

It would be useful in this connection to recall the flexibility of the party's structure and its adaptability to the frequently changing circumstances of clandestine and legal activities before the Great October Revolution. The party's structure could undergo a quick change in accordance with the new circumstances even after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. For example, starting with the 1960s, party committees were set up in trade and public catering, in railroad junctions and in large shop party organizations, as well as cour- of secretaries in party organizations of production associations. Nor should we fail to mention the great importance of the resolution of the November 1964 CPSU Central Committee Plenum which restored the Leninist territorial-production principle in the party's organizational structure, which had been violated 2 years earlier.

However, nor should we fail to see the negative phenomena in the process of party construction in the 1970s and beginning of 1980s: the inflation in the size of the party apparatus and surplus personnel. For example, whereas in 1965 the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee employed 159 senior personnel and 48 technical workers, currently the respective figures are 240 and 68. The same trend is seen in the obkoms. In 1965 the six obkoms of the Belorussian party organization numbered a total of 352 senior and 98 technical personnel compared to the present more than 500 and 144, respectively. The quantitative growth of the apparatus was noted essentially on the obkom and higher levels. In more than 20 years no substantial changes have taken place in the size of the gorkom and city and rural raykom personnel. In this case increases were between one and four senior personnel.

What was the reason for the quantitative growth of the party apparatus? A study has indicated that it was essentially due to the creation of new sectorial departments. In 1965 the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee consisted of 13 departments (including



party commissions and administration of affairs). Currently it has 18 departments (including the Party Control Commission and administration of affairs). The number of departments has also increased in the obkoms of the Belorussian Communist Party. Whereas in 1965 all obkoms other than Minsk had eight departments each (including the party commissions), today they already number 13 or 14, with 16 in the Minsk Obkom. These figures are not the exception for they apply to virtually the entire party, its oblast committees and the central committees of communist parties of union republics.

As a rule, the departmentalization of party committees on the basis of economic sectors is justified by the need to strengthen the party's influence on the work of a specific sector. However, by no means is the creation of new departments always preceded by serious reasons. It also happens that the first secretary may talk his superiors into opening a new department. This was particularly easily attainable in pre-April times. Unquestionably, a stricter procedure must be applied in structuring party committees, based on objective criteria and fixed standards. For the time being such criteria and standards remain greatly eroded, as confirmed by the lack of direct correlation between the number of departments within a party committee and the size of the party organization it controls and the economic potential of its territory. For instance, together with their party control commissions, the Brest and Mogilev obkoms of the Belorussian Communist Party number 14 departments each. The Brest Oblast party organization has 81,000 members and the Mogilev one, 84,000. Meanwhile, the Gomel Oblast party organization has 111,000 members and candidate members and the one in Vitebsk Oblast, 106,000. Either of these two, however, together with its party commissions, has 13 departments.

The quantitative increase in the number of party committee departments does not merely result in surplus personnel. It greatly hinders efforts to end substituting for soviet and economic agencies and to eliminate their duplication, as practical experience convincingly proves. By virtue of their specific functions, the personnel of such departments frequently turn into a kind of representatives and even technologists and dispatchers of enterprises and departments they supervise. They become excessively burdened by routine economic affairs, such as ensuring the supply of enterprises with materials and raw materials, "extracting" freight cars, machines and cement, etc. In frequent cases the sectorial department of the party committee takes up the defense not of party or state but departmental and parochial interests. Nor is it a secret that, as a rule, in their on-site visits the departmental personnel are interested not in the practices of the party's leadership or problems of the work style of the primary party organizations and their ideological education work but in the purely economic aspects of the work.

Sensing the "inescapability" of rigid supervision and direct substitution of the functions of primary party

organizations, soviet and economic authorities and public organizations, some party committees have begun to look for a solution to the developing situation. An experiment involving so-called "all-round" instructors is being conducted in the Kalininskiy, Krasnopresnenskiy, Sverdlovskiy and Sovetskiy party raykoms in Moscow, many raykoms in Leningrad, Krasnodar Kray, Riga's Moskovskiy Rayon, the Daugavpils party committee in Latvia, and some others. These instructors have been assigned to the primary party organizations and supervise all aspects of their activities instead of some specific area. Although it is still too early to draw any definite conclusions, there are reasons to believe that this innovation may become one of the most efficient means of making the party committee a political management authority. This would apply not only to raykoms and gorkoms but also to obkoms, kraykoms and central committees of communist parties of union republics.

I believe that it would be particularly important today especially for the party to set the example in perestroika and promote through its actions the all-round renovation of our society. Let us note that successful efforts to streamline the structure of party committees have already been made in the past. Thus, subsequent to the reorganization of the apparatus of the VKP(b) Central Committee at the start of 1930 its nine departments were reduced to seven. Prior to the reorganization, the VKP(b) Central Committee apparatus numbered 550 members, reduced to 375 after it. With a view to strengthening the party's leadership, the 18th VKP(b) Congress decided to convert from a production-sectorial to a functional party apparatus structure. A considerable number of sectorial departments of the VKP(b) Central Committee and the local party committees were abolished.

Naturally, perfecting the party's organizational structure and optimizing the size of its full-time personnel should not be viewed as strictly organizational, and even less so technical, measures. These are measures directly related to the development of democratic principles within the party, the enhancement of the role of its elected authorities and the activeness of the membership and the streamlining of party work style and methods. In the final account, this is a question of enhancing the vanguard role of the CPSU in solving the revolutionary problems of perestroika. The structure of the party committees leads to the best possible organization of party forces for the solution of current problems, without being in the least a self-seeking objective. V.I. Lenin cautioned that "the underdeveloped and weak forms prevent us from taking major further steps in the development of the content. This causes shameful stagnation and leads to the waste of efforts and disparity between words and actions" (*Poln. Sobr. Soch.* [Complete Collected Works], vol 8, p 378).

Reducing the number of sectorial departments and their personnel also has an important political implication and would lead to profound quality changes. To begin

with, this is the best means of "physically" restraining the command-administrative management style. Second, such a step provides a real possibility of upgrading the role of party strictly political work, for the energy and forces of party committee personnel would no longer be so unsparingly wasted in economic and administrative work. It will provide the party apparatus with the opportunity to undertake to upgrade its professional level and political standards and concentrate on the solution of long-term problems. Third, the cost of maintaining the party apparatus would decline tangibly. Fourth, the elimination of duplication would allow the soviets of people's deputies and the numerous public organizations to enhance their activities.

I believe that in closing down or combining many party committee departments we should not fear setting up some new ones which would be new not only in name but in the nature of their work. My view is that the real situation has long called for including in the party committee structure, particularly on the obkom and higher levels, departments in charge of the scientific organization of labor. Their functions would include helping the party committees and their apparatus to improve their work efficiency on a scientific basis, summing-up and disseminating progressive experience in party work and studying and analyzing public opinion. Incidentally, experience in the organization and functioning of such departments has been gained by some fraternal parties, the BCP and the SED in particular. Such experience should be studied and all of its valuable aspects adopted by us. We also have our own, albeit neglected, experience. Thus, noteworthy in the structure of the VKP(b) Central Committee, which as established after the 1930 reorganization, was the sector in charge of developing problems of party building. The sector was part of the Organizational-Instructors' Departments and dealt essentially with summarizing and utilizing acquired practical experience.

Nor should we neglect in the least the present extremely centralized procedure governing tables of organization, setting the salaries of party committee personnel and salary appropriations. As was noted at the plenums of many party committees, the situation which has developed in this area deprives the local party authorities of all initiative and autonomy. Excessive centralization always multiplies and disseminates manifestations of bureaucracy.

Following is, in my view, a quite typical example of this:

The gosagroprom system was created and tables of organization and personnel wages were set, forgetting the salaries of party committee personnel. It took almost a full year before numerous requests and appeals on this matter brought results. Throughout this time, in Belorussia the party committee secretary of the republic gosagroprom received the salary he was paid in his previous position.

The right of a party committee independently to determine the size of its personnel is a mandatory and very important prerequisite for restructuring party work. First of all, this opens to the party committee the way to efficiently handling the use of its forces. Granting the party committees the autonomous right to set up their own structure would help them to find and make use of available tested experience in organizing the work of the party apparatus most efficiently. Particularly topical in this connection, I believe, is the conclusion formulated at the 10th RKP(b) Congress: "Generally speaking, contradictions between the requirements of the newly developing situation, on the one hand, and the established form of party organization and its work methods, on the other, can be detected before the need to change course has become imminent." Pay attention to the fact that the contradictions are noted before the need for change arises. Since such a need has now been realized everywhere, is it not time to act firmly and purposefully?

The situation which has currently developed within the CPSU concerning the structure of party committees, collective leadership, criticism and self-criticism and glasnost reflects the existence of processes of bureaucratization in the party organizations and the growth of powers granted to the party apparatus to the detriment of the elected authorities. However, this is also a result of the fact that CPSU internal party processes are not being studied. The scientific forces dealing with party building consist of a small department of the CPSU Central Committee IML, sectors (3-5 people) of IML branches and departments of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the higher party schools, all told some 100 people. Even a simple comparison between this number and the number of cadres dealing with the history of the CPSU, scientific communism, philosophy and the other social sciences would be difficult to make.

What is the quality of party-building cadres? There are no more than some 15 doctors of sciences throughout the country, most of them about to be or already pensioned off. All of this makes the task of upgrading the scientific level of cadres dealing with party building problems quite topical. We must frankly admit that the attitude toward a science determines scientific results. The impression is created that some party workers occasionally forget even the existence of this science. Under such circumstances, party building as a science is in no condition to act as a true generator of ideas on the laws, ways and prospects of intraparty development or exert a serious influence on contemporary party practices.

Restructuring party activities would be virtually impossible without increasing support not only for the sciences of party building and history but also education, psychology, sociology and philosophy. V.I. Lenin taught us this, emphasizing that "the political activities of the social democratic party will always include a certain element of education..." (op. cit., vol 10, p 357). A direct link between party life and the social sciences and their

interpenetration become particularly important today, for no task related to socioeconomic acceleration, as we know, cannot be resolved without the application of the best qualities of man.

V. Tambortsev, war and labor veteran, Grozny: "How to Enter One's Home?"

I asked myself the following question: What procedure regulates relations between the party member and the CPSU obkom personnel?

I recall that during the tenure of N.S. Khrushchev as party first secretary, a CPSU member could enter the CPSU obkom building by displaying his party card. In Brezhnev's time the procedure was changed and has not been amended to this day.

To begin with, the existence of a party card is not considered grounds for a party member to see a CPSU obkom instructor.

Second, any suggestion related to improving party work or dealing with matters of conceptual restructuring must be submitted almost exclusively by telephone, for the obkom personnel are always too busy to spare a few minutes for a person-to-person talk with a party comrade. Apparently they have their own idea of party comradeship.

Third, even if a party member comes up with a suggestion of national significance, he must put his name down on a list and wait for his turn.

Should I, however, wish to report to the first obkom secretary that a given official within the apparatus is unsuitable for his position, my intention may prove to be unattainable. I have estimated that in an entire day no more than 10 people could turn to the obkom on their own initiative. All others are summoned...

The result? A party member has no right freely to enter the premises of his party committee, his own home (to quote M.S. Gorbachev). For whose sake, therefore, is the CPSU gorkom established, in this case? Is it for the party members? Or, conversely is it the party members who exist for the sake of the obkom? I believe the former to be correct, for if there are no party members there would be no obkom.

The CPSU statutes stipulate that a party member has the right to address himself right up to.... But how can this right be exercised if the party obkom personnel prefer to deal with the party members by telephone?

Could it be that all obkom instructors are under such heavy work pressure that they have never time to hear our rank-and-file party member and listen to his views?... Or could it be that they already know everything?

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

#### **New Approaches to Solving the Country's Water Problems**

18020010h Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 90-100

[Interview with Academicians B.N. Laskorin and V.A. Tikhonov]

[Text] Not so long ago water resources were not considered a determining factor in solving the problems of the location of production forces. In recent decades problems of the utilization and purity of natural waters has assumed vital importance. Such problems became particularly aggravated when expensive hydroengineering reclamation began to account for an increasing share of the national income. Such expenditures are a heavy burden on the state budget. The quality of the water worsened sharply and in a number of areas the ecological situation became critical. These problems became particularly pressing and the focal point of a discussion on the strategy of developing the various parts of the country and the agroindustrial complex. The unprecedented broad public discussion of problems related to projects for the redistribution of the river stock among different basins led to a revision and elimination of previous decisions in the landmark CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Terminating Work on the Transport of Some of the Stock of Northern and Siberian Rivers." The decree formulated new approaches to the solution of water supply problems, based on the application of progressive water conservation technologies, rejection of the extensive increase in water consumption and ruinous ambitious departmental projects. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers recently passed the decree "On Priority Measures Aimed at Improving the Utilization of Water Resources in the Country," which note that one of the most important trends in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development is the efficient management of water resources, which largely determines the development of the country's production process and further improvements in the living conditions of the people.

In this connection the editors invited Academician Boris Nikolayevich Laskorin, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Commission on the Development of Problems of the Protection of Natural Waters, and VASKH-NIL Academician Vladimir Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, head of the department of economics and organization of the agroindustrial complex of the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy, and asked them to answer our questions.

Following is a recording of this talk conducted by Viktor Yaroshenko, *KOMMUNIST* special correspondent.



**Question.** In your view, what has triggered the gravity of the water problems which have appeared in parts of the country?

**B.N. Laskorin.** In my view, the "water shortage theory" was fabricated by interested departments and the institutes serving their interests, the Soyuzgiprovodkhov Institute and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Water Problems above all. The essence of this concept is that, allegedly, the water in our country has been distributed unfairly and unevenly, that inevitably water consumption will grow and that, consequently, water scarcity will appear and will worsen on the southern slope so that, in order to prevent any hindrance to the development of the national economy and social progress (particularly in the southern areas, the Central Asian Republics above all) additional water resources must be prudently provided.

For example, here is what G.V. Voropayev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and director of the Academy of Sciences Institute of Water Problems, wrote in the journal ZVEZDA VOSTOKA (no. 6, 1987): "And how will this area continue to live in the future? For without water there would be no life in it! .... Today, as it is, the area is unable to procure even one-half of the food it needs and by the year 2000 the basin of the Aral Sea will house no longer 34 but some 50 million people. What are we to do? Should we reduce the size of the cotton crops? Something has to give. Should we totally eliminate the crop? This would offer a solution to the problem but another problem would appear: not all needs can be met with synthetic fabrics and, furthermore, we must supply cotton to the CEMA members, close down the cotton plants we have built and write off their equipment, etc., worth several billion rubles. Perhaps the younger population of the sunny republics will move to Siberia, Norilsk or Kolyma, for those areas need people. Some people may indeed go, but not 15 or 20 million! But even there one must feed and clothe the people!"

Let us note the quick-tempered tone of this publication. When it is a question of the fate of millions of people, responsibility and a serious approach must not be doubled but become ten times greater, for people trust science and the scientists. Did the director of the Institute of Water Problems have the right to issue prescriptions for solving this most complex problem set of social, economic, demographic, cultural, ecological and ideological problems? The suggestion is to untangle the knot of problems in one fell swoop with the help of a Trans-Siberian canal.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** Yes, a difficult situation has developed in Central Asia and it must be solved in a new way, by revising a number of accepted stereotypes. To claim, on behalf of a single department (recently G.V. Voropayev, who had amazed many people with his solution, was appointed the official permanent representative of the Academy of Sciences to the USSR Minvudkhov) to be

the holder of the only true understanding of all such problems is, to say the least, not serious. However, the entire idea of the growing scarcity of water is being developed on the basis of two unproven postulates. The first is that there is little water in the southern part of the country and a surplus in the north; the second is that water consumption should increase with the development of the national economy.

**B.N. Laskorin.** Efforts are being made to prove to us that our country's natural-climatic conditions are unfavorable for agriculture, and that precipitation is extremely low over a considerable part of the arable land. Allegedly, all of this inevitably requires extensive irrigation facilities. Would it not be more logical, however, to take natural and climatic conditions fully into consideration in land cultivation and the location of farm crops?

**V.A. Tikhonov.** Too much land is being cultivated and there has been excessive plowing of pasture land in Kalmykiya, the steppes of Kazakhstan, the swamps of the Polesye, the southern part of the Ukraine, Western Siberia, and tundra and high-mountain areas. All of this has yielded small results. We would eliminate a great deal of losses if we cultivate our land in accordance with natural conditions instead of trying to remake nature with the help of a departmental technology.

**B.N. Laskorin.** According to our estimates, based on official statistical data, river stock reserves in the southern slope amount not to 60 but a minimum of 110 cubic kilometers.

As to the river stock itself, has it been all that unfairly distributed by nature? In the European part of the country 31 percent of the water is carried by rivers flowing north; 12 percent, west and 57 percent, south. What is unfair about this? Furthermore, the ground stock, a significant part of which is in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, is substantial. Let us not forget that, on a global scale, we have unique reserves of fresh water in our great lakes (alas, which we have polluted to a shameful state). Nor should we ignore the virtually unlimited resources of saline waters of the seas and oceans (the use of such waters for industrial purposes is rapidly expanding abroad). Furthermore, ignoring precipitation is a grave error. More than one-half of the atmospheric precipitation goes not into the surface stock, i.e., the rivers, but remains in the ground and is partially used up in plant transpiration and evaporation. This amounts to about 5.5 thousand cubic kilometers of water. Soil moisture can be used more efficiently. The methods used for solving this problem have long been known and are relatively inexpensive. The principal among them is agricultural timber reclamation which, unfortunately, is not sufficiently considered in our country.

Now as to water consumption trends. During the 11th 5-year period the national income increased by 19 percent; areas under irrigation increased by 2.5 million

hectares. Nonetheless, fresh water diversion declined by 18 cubic kilometers per year from 1980 to 1986. Meanwhile, nonrecoverable water consumption was reduced even more, by 43 cubic kilometers. Some of it was the result of the efforts invested in developing the recirculation of water and water conservation.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** In my view, this trend is of essential significance. Actually, the steady growth of water consumption over many years has been halted and even turned back. Perhaps with some delay, we have nonetheless taken the only possible way in modern economic management, the way of the economical utilization of all resources, including water. However, this trend does not suit the theoreticians of water scarcity, for it defeats their arguments, for which reason they prefer to ignore it. According to their forecasts, for example, by the year 2000 the overall water diversion in the USSR should increase by more than 20 percent. Meanwhile, the 14 August 1986 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Halting the Work on Transferring Some of the Stock of Northern and Siberian Rivers" clearly stipulates the requirement of reducing water outlays for industrial-household, agricultural and other needs by 15-20 percent this very 5-year period.

**Question.** But what if caution does not help? What if we include water conservation in our plans but are unable to achieve it? Will the future not be the judge?

**B.N. Laskorin.** In formulating plans and allocating resources on their basis we predetermine the future. If we allocate resources for transferring, no conservation would be possible. The USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Water Problems developed two forecast variants: "extensive" and "intensive." According to the "intensive" scenario, by the year 2000 absolute water consumption should be reduced by yet another 51 cubic kilometers, or 17.7 percent (incidentally, the variant computed for the year 2010 will be cheaper by 43 billion rubles). However, it is not this economical approach that dominates practical considerations; it is the "extensive" one, the one which perpetuates waste.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** Water-resource managers speak of a grave water scarcity in the Ukraine as well. They are planning a 15 percent increase in the republic's water consumption.

Such computations have been refuted by scientists from the UkSSR Academy of Sciences. Thus, according to the Council for the Study of Production Forces of the Ukrainian SSR, there is no fatal scarcity of water in the basins of the Dnepr and Yuzhnyy Bug rivers. Nor is there an increase in water consumption. According to 1987 state water records, Ukrainian water resources (excluding the Danube River) exceed previous estimates by 5.3 cubic kilometers. Water consumption in the republic will be reduced even without abandoning present technology and introducing a water conservation system. The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences has reached

the conclusion that significant water reserves are available, that there is no need to transfer water from the Danube to the Dnepr and that the blocking of the Dnepr-Bug estuary would be inexpedient.

The substantiation of the computations made by the USSR Minvodkhoz is rather questionable. According to them, by the year 2000 water intake in our country should reach 430 cubic kilometers, which would include 38.5 cubic kilometers for irrigation. Today, as it were, an excessively large amount of water is being wasted on irrigation, which salinizes and puts land out of circulation. Our irrigation rates are excessive and could be reduced by 15 percent without any harm (or, more accurately, to the benefit of the crops). This alone, incidentally, would save about 20 cubic kilometers of water. It is said that water is in scarce supply in Central Asia although our generous irrigation rates are being substantially exceeded. In 1980 they were exceeded by a factor of 1.6 in Uzbekistan, a factor of 2 in Kazakhstan, 1.6 in Tajikistan, 1.7 in Turkmeniya and 1.3 in the RSFSR. The condition in which irrigation systems are kept is beneath all criticism. According to the USSR People's Control Committee, in 1982 nearly one-half of the water collected for irrigation in Astrakhan, Volgograd and Rostov Oblasts and Krasnodar Kray was used unproductively. Losses have reached 40 percent in the Chernozem zone and as much as 60 percent in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and the Transcaucasus.

For the sake of brevity let us not cite details of such proof and mention merely the end conclusion: the use of water for irrigation could be reduced by 60 cubic kilometers annually.

**B.N. Laskorin.** Equally unsubstantiated is the forecast of increased water consumption in industry, power and the communal economy.

We must take into consideration global trends and the indicators of industrially developed countries in which technological and structural reorganization has been carried out most successfully. In those countries the rate of lowering water consumption is entirely different and higher. In the United States fresh water intake was reduced by 55 cubic kilometers between 1975 and 1980. In recent years it has stabilized, and the use of sea water has been increased significantly which, in our country, remains virtually unused. All developed countries are reducing not only specific water consumption (which is mandatory!) but also the absolute amount of the water intake.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** The variant of stabilization of water consumption, to the best of my knowledge, is somewhat "excessively radical." We are facing an endless amount of work to reduce the specific consumption of water, energy, fuel and raw materials which, in my view, should entail a revision of a number of priorities, previously

considered inviolable, including refining and revising a number of stipulations of the energy program, not to mention the reclamation program.

**B.N. Laskorin.** Incidentally, the concept of the energy program was not discussed extensively by the scientific and technical public but was "issued" to us. It included a simple extrapolation of increased power consumption in the future. The monopoly-holding departments are trying to perpetuate their positions and to influence the future through forecasts, standards and growth rates which would guarantee their future real economic power.

Here is an example from the area of chemical technology, with which I am most familiar. The synthesis of ammonia was one of the most energy-intensive types of output. The new so called energy-technological system was developed in our country but equipment for the new plants had been purchased from Japan and the United States. In this case expenditures of energy and specific water consumption are substantially lower compared with the old synthesizing systems.

According to the USSR Minvodkhoz, in 1985 52 cubic kilometers of water—the entire annual flow of the Dnepr—were wasted. Let me emphasize that this figure does not include losses of distribution canals, irrigation networks or on the fields themselves (for by no means does the entire amount of water which reaches the field help increase productivity), and losses in the communal economy and in industry. "Everything goes somewhere," is the ecological law. Excessive losses have led to negative consequences, the struggle with which runs into the billions of rubles, involving the flooding of many cities in the country, including even those in the droughty area (Guryev, Ashkhabad, Bukhara, Tashkent and others) and the swamping and salinization of farm land.

Great opportunities exist in industry as well. Today at frontranking enterprises the indicator of the level of recycled and reused amount of water supplies has reached 95 percent. If this indicator is raised throughout the country from 69 (which it is today) to 90 percent (which would be realistic) we would save about 70 cubic kilometers of fresh water.

Incidentally, in Central Asia where, it is claimed, a stressed water balance has developed, the utilization of water by industry is organized particularly poorly: the share of recycled water is only 21 percent in the Turkmen SSR, 39 percent in the Kirghiz SSR and 49 percent in the Uzbek SSR. Let us note that the building of recirculation systems is less expensive by a factor of 10 compared with the building of corresponding systems for the treatment of effluents.

Substantial possibilities also exist in the housing and communal economy, which is the third largest fresh water consumer. A total of 24.6 cubic kilometers of water were collected for the needs of communal and drinking water supplies in 1985, 20 percent of which was wasted.

Our use of expensive drinking water is excessively wasteful. We do not observe efficient user rates (ranging from 125 to 350 liters per person). In 1980 Minsk, the population of which has a full water supply, used 283 liters per person per day; Tallin used 428, Leningrad 456 and Moscow 598 (according to some data 700 liters!). The southern cities are not behind: the figures are 564 for Dushanbe and 811 for Tashkent; daily water use in the cities in Bukhara Oblast is 1108 liters per person. Everywhere a great deal of water is taken from urban drinking water mains to meet industrial needs (an average of about 30 percent for the country in 1985).

Let us consider the example of Moscow. Here 10 percent of the supplied water flowing through the water mains is wasted; another 20 percent is wasted from leakage caused by improper equipment; about 15 percent is lost as a result of the lack of regulated water pressure reaching residential homes. Another 15 percent could be saved with the help of modern water conservation systems. As a result, a significant percentage of the water used in the Moscow housing and communal economy is wasted. Does this not prove that additional water supplies for Moscow are not only unnecessary but even harmful and that there is absolutely no need to build the Rzhev hydraulic power junction and other expensive projects but that there is need to reconstruct enterprises and update the Moscow water main system.

**Question.** Agriculture, irrigated agriculture in particular, is the main water consumer.

There has been a great deal of discussion in recent years on the effectiveness of reclamation and yields per irrigated hectare. Huge funds are being invested by the country in reclamation. How well are we using them and what returns are we getting? This will not be the least important factor in improving the health of our economy.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** According to Minvodkhoz data, in 1985 145 cubic kilometers of water were used for irrigation. I believe that the actual figures are higher. During the 11th 5-year period 20 percent of the irrigated land in Uzbekistan, Turkmeniya, Kazakhstan, Georgia and Armenia yielded grain crops of under 15 quintals per hectare; 45 percent of the irrigated land in Russia and 31 percent of irrigated land in the Ukraine, Georgia and Armenia and 41 percent of Uzbek irrigated land planted in corn yielded under 30 quintals per hectare. One third of all irrigated land yielded less than 40 quintals per hectare. With modern agrotechnical methods such yields are an indication of the totally useless investment of many billions of rubles.

For what reason are the Minvodkhoz and its supporters so persistently defending their program of endlessly increasing the size of their projects?



I am convinced that this is based on purely departmental interests and the desire to retain control over huge material resources and to increase them. These interests coincide with those of some local authorities who hope to "procure" capital investments for the development of their territory with the help of energetic Minvodkhoz officials.

**Question.** What can you say about claims to the effect that yields from irrigated land are several hundred percent higher than from unirrigated land?

**V.A. Tikhonov.** Let us see what we are talking about. The results of reclamation may be expressed in terms of the "added" amount of output from the reclaimed (drained or irrigated) field. It can be determined by calculating yields from a given area before and after reclamation. Nonetheless, the USSR Minvodkhoz considers as the result of reclamation and gives itself credit for the entire output of an irrigated or drained area.

I recomputed the output precisely looking for the added yields, by looking at data for the period between 1971 and 1985. In grain production (including rice) additions from reclamation (in the gross grain harvest) totaled 7.3 million tons and the share of output resulting from reclamation—in percentage figures—was 8.3 percent as estimated by the Minvodkhoz, but no more than 3.9 percent according to our method. The same applied to all basic crops such as 9.5 vs. 20.6 percent for fodder, 0.5 vs. 4.1 percent for potatoes, and 8 percent but by no means 42 percent for vegetables. In terms of cost the entire output additionally obtained through reclamation averaged 4.5 percent of the cost of gross crop output and not 14.1 percent as estimated by the Minvodkhoz. The conclusion is that the actual economic results of water reclamation are several hundred percent lower than departmental estimates.

According to our computations, based on the results of the 11th 5-year period, the cost per ton of additional grain produced on reclaimed land is 466 rubles (with a price for high-grade wheat of 150 rubles per ton). The average cost per ton of fodder from irrigated land for the entire European part of the RSFSR is 858 rubles. The cost of a ton of additional weight in cattle raised with such fodder is no less than 8,200 rubles (triple the average cost of weight increases obtained with feed raised on unirrigated land). In terms of meat commodity, and applying the highest possible coefficient of 0.52, the result will be that 1 kilogram of marketable meat averages 16 rubles (excluding overhead). As you can see, this is ruinous, as store customers know.

**Question.** A total of 79.1 billion rubles have been invested in water resource construction between 1971 and 1985. What kind of results were achieved?

**V.A. Tikhonov.** A total 11.7 million hectares of land have been irrigated and 11.5 million hectares have been drained. However, millions of hectares were withdrawn

from use for a variety of reasons, such as salinization, flooding, condemnation, erosion, etc. The actual increase was 8.8 million hectares of irrigated and 7.2 million hectares of drained land on which calculations should be based. Meanwhile, specific investments per hectare increased (from 3,700 rubles in 1971-1975 to 6,556 rubles in 1981-1985). The volume of other important types of reclamation declined sharply. Watering of pasture land declined by more than one half (from 44.2 to 19 million hectares), and the area of technological cultivation projects declined (from 9.1 to 7.1 million hectares). Even the leveling of irrigated land was neglected (it declined by 11 percent). The cost of the use of drained and irrigated land increased substantially.

**Question.** How are such outlays redeemed? Within what periods of time?

**V.A. Tikhonov.** According to estimates of the USSR Minvodkhoz itself the actual redemption time for the 1981-1985 period was 25.6 years (with a standard rate of capital investment recovery average of 8 years for the national economy). Such indicators entirely fail to meet the requirements of upgrading our economic efficiency. The actual situation, however, is even worse. An accurate computation of the amount of additional output, taking all outlays—direct and indirect—into consideration indicates that recovery time exceeds 100 years!

Last year the full cost of the industrial construction projects of the USSR Minvodkhoz, which were included in the plan, totaled 29.6 billion rubles. The lag between the actual construction and the stipulated rate is an average of 50 months. Here are some examples: the Pallasovka irrigation-system, estimated at 94.7 million rubles, has been under construction in Volgograd Oblast since 1967. It is 187 months behind the completion deadline. The big Volgograd irrigation system has been under construction since 1973 (it is 108 months behind schedule). Nonetheless, without completing these and other construction projects, in 1986 the simultaneous construction of the Olenevskaya, Kalachevskaya, Kotelnikovo and Kamyshin irrigation systems was undertaken in the same oblast.

In Rostov Oblast the Manychskaya irrigation system has been under construction since 1967 and the Bagayev-Sadkovskaya irrigation system, since 1971. The Kakhovka irrigation system in Kherson Oblast has been under construction since 1967 (86 percent of it has been completed). Many more such examples could be cited. Let us add that temporarily the USSR Minvodkhoz has terminated or halted the construction of 2,213 projects totaling 1.225 billion rubles. Of these, 454 million rubles have already been totally lost....

Should we go on pouring billions into the land with the knowledge that, even should they be recovered, it would take a century?

**B.N. Laskorin.** Nonetheless, as in the past, the Minvodkhoz and its supporters are planning the most extensively possible development of irrigation. Having failed in the project of transferring northern waters and developing, on their basis, irrigation in the south and having lost (temporarily, they believe) the northern parts of the project, they are promoting the southern parts. In 1982 work was started on projects covering the preparatory period for a second Volga-Dawn canal, the cost of which is estimated in excess of 400 million rubles. They are preparing to develop an extensive irrigated amount of land in Stavropol Kray and Kalmykiya by transferring to this area the waters from the Volga along the Volga-Chogray canal. Let us consider this project especially. Work on its implementation was started in 1985 "as an exception," in circumvention of existing regulations. The project was severely criticized recently by a number of scientists. An expert commission, headed by Academician A.L. Yanshin, USSR Academy of Sciences vice president, was set up by the academy. Experts (ecologists, hydrologists, economists, geologists, soil experts, etc.) visited Kalmykiya and Stavropol Kray and made a thorough study of the project and the actual farming practices in the area. The commission has not completed its work but I can already state my opinion as one of its members, an opinion which coincides with that of my colleagues: There is clear lack of substantiation for this project and it should be rejected and both work on it and its financing should be stopped.

The plan of the developers is to divert water from the Volga to the existing Chogray water reservoir along an earthen canal 353 kilometers long. The cost of the construction of the canal has been assessed at 554.2 million rubles. The project calls for the irrigation of 210,000 hectares of land, 135,000 of which in Stavropol Kray.

The cost of the installation of irrigation systems and their equipment is assessed at 1.8 billion rubles. The assignment for drafting the first part of the project for the canal (note the term "part") was issued to the planners by the USSR Minvodkhoz management in October 1984, when they considered the question of the transfer of northern waters solved.

The canal would take 1.9 cubic kilometers of Volga water per year. This would have an impact, which is difficult to anticipate, on the ecological situation along the lower reaches of the Volga, which has already become dramatic, and on the reproduction of sturgeon, the last natural spawning grounds of which are located precisely in the area of the planned water intake.

The planners claim that the canal would have ecological and social purposes; it would provide water for the Kalmyk population and help to grow feed for the cattle; it would halt desertification which is advancing at the rate of 50,000 hectares annually. The project (drawn by the Sevkvagiprovodkhoz Institute) abounds in frivolous

arguments, stretched points and figure juggling, to put it charitably. They are particularly weak in the part discussing economic efficiency.

**Question.** Obviously, your commission, disagreeing with them, has formulated its own arguments? To what extent have they been accepted by your opponents?

**B.N. Laskorin.** The commission's conclusions, the conclusions of the experts, prove that the reason for the worsening situation of agriculture in Kalmykiya is not some kind of critical natural situation but the criminal-irresponsible activity of people over a long period of time, the excessive plowing of the land (which has resulted in the destruction of the best natural fodder land and water reservoirs); exceeding the admissible herd density per unit farm land; groundless development of irrigation, resulting in mass salinization and loss of water over large areas. One could hardly expect the designers to agree with this.

Unquestionably, the Kalmyk population needs fresh water. Such water can and must be provided through the main pipeline from Stavropol (where reserves of fresh water have been found). It would be inexpedient to irrigate the Kalmyk lands. This will yield no results. Instead, it would bring about adverse ecological consequences, especially the virtual disappearance of a unique European saiga, the number of which has already drastically declined (from 800,000 to 200,000 head). An alternative to the canal could be (after further work and development) a general plan for the struggle against the desertification of the Chernyye lands and the Kizlyar pasture land, which would enable us to improve the entire farm land in the area instead of having only 4 percent of the land irrigated; it would not have adverse ecological effect and its cost would be a quarter that of the projected 1.8 billion rubles.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** It is important to understand that this project, like many others such as, for example, the Danube-Dnepr canal, the construction of which is categorically opposed by the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and the broad public opinion in the republic, is part of an overall very broad strategy which, in our view, is erroneous.

Based on the figures of the program for reclamation, which was adopted before the country adopted perestroika, the plan is to increase the area of irrigated land to 30 million hectares by the year 2000. The water resource authorities persistently defend these figures, the absurdity of which, under the present circumstances, the circumstances of a difficult structural reorganization of the economy, is obvious. This 5-year period, however, once again 73.7 billion rubles were appropriated for reclamation of all types, or 25 percent more than in the preceding 5-year period.

Three years ago, when sharp criticism of economic and technical policy in the area of reclamation started, under circumstances of stagnation in which the country was still functioning, the department was able to turn the situation to its own advantage. The victory it won, however, was truly Pyrrhic. The actual practices of our reclamation work were subject to quite serious criticism and excesses were made public.

The reclamation program designed by Soyuzgiprovdokhoz, based on the concept of extensive expansion of irrigated areas and further increase in the cost of agricultural output and the concept of unrestrained increase in water consumption, became morally obsolete before it could be applied.

**B.N. Laskorin.** One cannot seriously discuss the use of water resources if one considers not the national economic efficiency or the well-being of the country but the striving to reach a certain figure. The task is not to satisfy insatiable departmental and parochial appetites but, under the conditions of cost accounting, to solve, once and for all, food problems and create a healthy human habitat.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** Above all, we must change the position which makes Minvodkhoz a monopoly holder, a "state within the state," with a huge budget. This is a unique department, no other such department exists. It is a department that draws its own plans based on the convenience of developing new areas (ignoring the fears of geologists and soil experts, and virtually without any soil studies, which are made after the canal has been built and the areas to be irrigated have been prepared); it determines its own work structure and has its own institutes in charge of planning and research. Its economic system is structured in such a way that consumers have virtually no possibility of controlling the work of Minvodkhoz. This is inadmissible under the conditions of the economic reform, for it threatens to wreck all the shoots of new relations developing in the countryside. Actually, the consumer is not charged for all such work and one does not look a gift horse in the mouth.... The only solution is the elimination of the monopoly status. Academician A.G. Aganbegyan rightly said that if canals are needed let those who need them pay for them! Let the labor collectives themselves determine how to handle the money and whether they need expensive reclamation or not. I am confident that half of the projects which are being carried out currently by Minvodkhoz will be considered unnecessary by the peasants. Perhaps something entirely different may turn out to be needed: antierosion work, roads, warehouses, storage bins, communications, information and scientific support....

Starting with 1989 all the enterprises and organizations of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources must convert to work under the new economic management conditions. That explains the hurry of that department to secure profitable projects for itself.

A new system of economic relations must be developed between the Minvodkhoz and the state budget, on the one hand, and the agricultural enterprises consuming its output, on the other.

**Question.** How do you imagine such a system?

**V.A. Tikhonov.** First, without waiting for the 13th 5-year period, as soon as possible we must abandon direct state budget financing of Minvodkhoz activities. Investments in state land improvement could be channeled through the Agroprombank system, interest free, and go not to the Minvodkhoz but to those who exploit the land and who directly need land reclamation, such as sovkhozes and kolkhozes and their associations. It is precisely they who must be given the right to determine the volumes and structures of reclamation projects, the areas where they are to be done, and the specific areas of land which must be improved; their specialists must be given the opportunity to compute the cost of such projects and the effect of their implementation.

It is on the basis of such computations that sovkhozes, kolkhozes and their cooperative associations can substantiate a program for land reclamation in specific areas, argue their project with the Agroprombank, obtain a loan from it, draft a purchase order to reclamation enterprises and sign economic contracts with them directly. The repayable nature of financing would increase the responsibility of agricultural enterprises and force kolkhozes and sovkhozes to try to obtain not estimated results but a real, a true enhancement of land fertility.

Naturally, such a system would require substantial changes in the economic status of Minvodkhoz.

**Question.** Let us go back to the problems of Central Asia we touched upon at the beginning of our talk. Here, in a number of areas a stressed situation is developing even with drinking water. The entire cotton crop raised in the USSR comes from irrigated land. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Stopping the Work on the Transfer..." calls for "the formulation of a comprehensive program for the development of the production forces of the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan for the period until the year 2010, taking into consideration developing demographic and water resource situations, perfecting the structure of agroindustrial production and other economic sectors." What is your view on the basic trends in the strategy of water consumption in Central Asia and Kazakhstan?

**B.N. Laskorin.** The principles are included in the decree you cited. The program must be comprehensive and not applied to water resources only. It should include structural problems and proceed on the basis of the study of the economic, social, demographic, medical, ecological and cultural situation. It would be very dangerous to pursue a one-sided primarily irrigation-oriented policy



of investments. Priority should be given to problems of upgrading the well being and social development and improving the health of the population.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** The policy of virtually unlimited expansion of irrigated areas, and pursuit of gross output and ever new cotton crop records, has led to the development of an exceptionally difficult ecological situation in the Republics of Central Asia. Millions of hectares have become salinized or flooded; the excess of drained water has led to the appearance of salt lakes and the planned use of the water of the Amudarya and Syrdarya, to ecological catastrophe and the drying out of the Aral Sea. Furthermore, as a result of violations of crop rotation rules and constant use of high amounts of fertilizers, toxic chemicals have worsened the health situation and the quality of the drinking water, particularly in the rural areas. The people are drinking mineralized water. A catastrophic situation in terms of water supplies has developed around the Aral Sea, above all in Karakalpakiya and Tashauz Oblast.

**B.N. Laskorin.** According to official data, here one-half of the rural population has to use for drinking and household purposes water from rivers, gullies and canals polluted by effluent water, toxic chemicals and bacteria. The rate of morbidity with infectious hepatitis and many other diseases and infant mortality are exceptionally and inadmissibly high.

I could add to these a number of other dramatic cases but that is not the point. The point is the way such facts are being interpreted and what steps are being suggested in their case. The promoters of the "transfer," who are particularly actively indoctrinating public opinion in the republics of Central Asia, draw a single conclusion: one must urgently go back to building a canal from Siberia. For example, Doctor of Agricultural Sciences I. Stepanov writes the following: "The crisis is beginning to appear in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. By the year 2000 it will break out with terrible force, at which point we shall be unable to provide efficient aid to the population suffering from lack of water: the building of the canal alone would require no less than 15-20 years!" Emotions are running high and appeals are being aimed to the national feelings and to the principles of fraternal international duty, which are sacred to the Soviet people.

What can we say on this subject? Feelings are poor help in a debate, particularly when it is a question of the lives of tens of millions of people. What are needed here are concerned sympathy shown for each substantiated argument and the greatest possible responsibility.

Let me particularly emphasize that we must distinguish between superficially similar but actually essentially different problems. The first and most important among them is ensuring the population of the republics of Central Asia with high quality drinking water and sewer systems. People must not drink water from canals. The water for drinking should be of an entirely different

quality. We could provide such water not in a quarter of a century but within a single 5-year period if we realize properly that this is a most important priority. The drop in the level of the Aral Sea is the result of decades of faulty water management policies followed in Central Asia. However, the people are being sick above all not for this reason but for the reason that they drink salinized and bacterially polluted water. They must be urgently supplied with good water. There are several methods through which this can be achieved: drilling artesian wells, water conduits and water mains and, finally, the use of membrane technology in water treatment, a well developed and efficient method, tested in a number of countries.

The UN General Assembly proclaimed the 1980s the international decade of securing drinking water and sanitation on a global scale and set the objective of ensuring clean water for everyone by the year 1990. According to the World Health Organization, approximately 80 percent of all diseases are the result of unsatisfactory water supplies and hygienic conditions.

It is a matter of honor for our country to ensure within the shortest possible time for its citizens a clean drinking water and sewer systems, the more so since this requires tens of times less funds than the building of canals. Drinking water should be supplied to Karakalpakiya, Kalmykiya, Khorezma and many areas in Kazakhstan, the Urals, and Turkmeniya. This problem is being successfully solved in the case of small settlements with the help of separate membrane water treatment systems. Instead of promoting panic and heating up passions, we must adopt the attitude that problems of drinking water supplies are primary. In Central Asia and Kazakhstan railroad stations have begun to use systems for desalination. I claim with a full feeling of responsibility that methods exist which would enable us to ensure quickly and reliably the population of Central Asia with high quality drinking water.

**V.A. Tikhonov.** The health, social pride and education of the people in Central Asia have been neglected quite severely. I believe that those who literally demand Siberian water for the further expansion of cotton fields, work on which is exhausting for months on end the strength of secondary and higher school students, will not meet with extensive support. Is it that there is a basic lack of water here? Looking around us like true managers, and trying to look into the future, one could hardly remain satisfied with the condition of housing, schools, hospitals, the processing capacities of the agroprom, and the structure of agricultural production, which is influenced by the excessive share of cotton grown in the fields....

Incidentally, reclamation workers show no willingness at all to build water mains. They are set aside even in the lists of long-term construction projects. You want examples? A group water main in Akhtubinsk and a group water main in Kharabali and Ikryanoye settlement,

Astrakhan Oblast, have been under construction since 1972; the Belovod group water main in Kokchetava Oblast has been under construction since 1971; the Presnovskiy group water main in North Kazakhstan Oblast has been under construction since 1967....

New approaches are needed today to the existing reality and a new understanding is needed of the concept for the development of the entire country and of each separate union republic.

On 24 December 1987 the CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved measures to improve the utilization of water resources and ensure the national economy and the population of the country with water. The corresponding authorities were asked to consider specific steps leading to the economical utilization of water resources with a view to the implementation of the new economic mechanism.

The recently adopted CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Priority Measures to Improve the Utilization of Water Resources in the Country" emphasizes that the lack of the necessary economic mechanism and efficient instruments and incentives, which would make it possible efficiently to influence radical improvements in water utilization, is a major shortcoming in water resource management. Major changes are being contemplated in investment policy as well as practical work to improve the utilization of the water as well as other resources, with a view to upgrading national economic efficiency.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

### My Opinion

18020010i Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 4, Feb 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 101-102

[Article by L. Kurashov, chairman of the Druzhba Kolkhoz, Kostromskiy Rayon, Kostroma Oblast, chairman of the oblast council of kolkhozes; comment on the Kolkhoz Model Statutes]

[Text] The kolkhoz model statutes, which were adopted in 1969 and supplemented in 1980, reflected quite fully the rights, obligations and autonomy of kolkhozes and the status of kolkhoz members. The trouble was that many kolkhozes were unable to make full use of their rights. For economic reasons and because of unskillful management of collective farming they were unable to sustain themselves through their earnings and to speak of autonomy with an empty pocket is not only not serious but even impossible.

Furthermore, the rayon leading authorities paid little heed to the kolkhoz statutes and applied to kolkhozes the rules governing state enterprises. The law enforcement authorities frequently ignored the statutes and based everything on the Code of Labor Laws.

Nor should we ignore the fact that essentially the kolkhoz is a self-financing enterprise and that the very essence of autonomy is lost when it is deprived of the freedom to acquire material resources and sell its produce.

The kolkhoz did not become the owner of the land, which is the origin of all troubles.

The supplements to the model statutes which would be most to my liking are the following:

Section IV, Point 13. The kolkhoz has the right to acquire materials, etc., against payment in cash. This is a good supplement, for how, otherwise could the kolkhoz purchase materials for housing repairs, help the retired repair their homes, or build sociocultural projects? Let us not forget that the kolkhoz does everything itself, unlike the sovkhoz. My only fear is that zealous financiers and "bankers" would deprive us of this right. They would find a way to do so.

The same section allows the kolkhozes the right to purchase technical facilities, materials and raw materials from other enterprises. This has been forbidden so far. But how else can we develop mutually profitable contacts with industrial enterprises? We sell them our produce and they sell surplus materials to the kolkhozes.

Who more than the kolkhoz needs to write off equipment and buildings if they have become morally obsolete or worn-out ahead of schedule? In the past, however, figure padding was allowed as decided by the general assembly on the basis of existing legislation, thus lowering kolkhoz rights to naught.

Section V stipulates that kolkhozes may participate on a voluntary basis in the activities of interkolkhoz associations, agrocombines, etc. But what if a kolkhoz is unwilling to do so despite the resolution of the general assembly?

What happened in our rayon was that an agrocombine was created without kolkhoz agreement. As to what kind of life this will provide no one can tell. The decision, meanwhile, has been made. Just try and understand. Who will allocate funds, etc.? The kolkhoz is pressured on all sides.

Something else: A kolkhoz may have joined an association in the past and now would like to withdraw. It turns out that it is impossible to resign voluntarily; or else the kolkhoz may pull out but leave its investments behind. However, these funds belong to the kolkhoz. The statutes must stipulate the right of voluntary withdrawal from the association without losing any investments.

Point 16 of Section V must be refined. In addition to state orders, which must account for 70 percent of the state plan, the kolkhoz should have the right to sell its produce as it wishes and where profitable—in the oblast or beyond it.

This would expand the area of kolkhoz activities. Kolkhozes would be able to find more profitable markets and engage in mutually profitable trade with enterprises in other oblasts. There is nothing frightening in this. The development of self-financing requires freedom, for without it anything else is merely verbiage. We fear that obstacles will be erected in the oblast in the matter of granting export permits.

In Section VI Points 27-28 seem repetitious. If we speak of cost accounting in the straight meaning of the term, as is the case with Point 27, it stipulates payment of wages and material bonuses for increasing production output, improving quality and conservation of material outlays; Point 28 also stipulates that additional payments, bonuses and others are used in order to upgrade material incentive.

Section X: It is obviously unnecessary for the kolkhoz board to submit a motion at the general assembly on the approval of chief specialists. But what happens? The chairman or the board have no right to hire a chief specialist. They should tell him, do some work first, and then the general assembly will consider whether to hire you or not. For the board does not consist of the chairman only. It is a collective authority, a major one, with the right to hire, fire or penalize a chief specialist. The approval at a general meeting is an unnecessary formality.

Point 54 of Section X must be made more specific and unequivocal. It stipulates that the brigade meeting elects a brigade leader who must then be approved by the kolkhoz board. What if the board does not approve him? Would this mean a conflict with the brigade?

It is further stated that the brigade meeting may submit a motion to relieve the brigade leader from his position if he has failed to justify the brigade's trust. But who would relieve him and who would choose his replacement? No, if we have chosen him ourselves it is up to us to relieve him and replace him with someone else.

In my view, however, based on practical experience, it would be better for the brigade to submit a request to the kolkhoz board on candidacies for the position of brigade leader or a motion for the leader's release, while the kolkhoz board would both appoint and dismiss, taking the collective's opinion into consideration. This would eliminate the possibility of appointing "good" chiefs as brigade leaders, as for the time being this is a difficult position in agriculture and few are willing to assume it.

Section IX, which discusses the private auxiliary plot, stipulates that the kolkhoz board will assist in the cultivation of the plot. This could imply that the kolkhoz would grow on the kolkhoz member's plot potatoes, vegetables, etc. The type of services to be provided to the kolkhoz member and their cost should be stipulated, for the plot is land on which the kolkhoz member grows additional products during his free time and it is here that he accustoms his children to work, as he does in raising cattle on his own. Any other method would be to the detriment of joint production.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

#### The Main Problem

18020018a Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Mar 88) pp 102-103

[Article by A. Onishchenko, department head, UkSSR corresponding member; comment on the Kolkhoz Model Statutes]

[Text] The draft Kolkhoz Model Statutes were discussed at a meeting of the Agrarian Problems of Socialism Department of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics. The statements provided an overall assessment of the draft and expressed a number of specific remarks.

As a whole, the speakers noted, the new Model Statutes are consistent with the spirit of the time, the stipulations of the 27th CPSU Congress and the need to democratize economic life in the country. The draft statutes include entirely new sections compared to the current edition. Section 8, in particular, entitled "The Kolkhoz Social Development," is new. Even the sections which have been retained include a number of new stipulations consistent with the principles of self-government. We are dissatisfied, however, with the style of presentation in which we sense a command-pressure spirit. In many places the draft appears not as a document formulated by a collective of cooperative farmers or in their name but as an instruction, a prescription from superiors on what to do and how to do it. This approach reduces the creative contribution of the kolkhozes to drafting their own statutes to a minimum and the result may resemble the old stipulation: all that distinguished the statutes of the individual kolkhozes from the Model Statutes was that the kolkhoz's name appeared on the front page.

The main problem today is to grant autonomy to the kolkhozes. For quite some time we have been saying that the kolkhozes are independently solving all basic problems related to their production activities. In fact they function under the rigid conditions of all kinds of restrictions on their rights. The economic mechanism which is still in place does not encourage them to increase agricultural output or to lower its cost.



The draft must include stipulations which would be more concise and cover general problems affecting all kolkhozes, and mandatorily include an item such as the following: No superior organizations (party, soviet economic or managerial) should interfere in the activities of a kolkhoz unless the latter violates Soviet laws. Laws have been passed according to which the kolkhoz must act independently without "valuable instructions" from superiors in cases pertaining to various production problems. Such instructions regulate each step taken by the kolkhoz and thus restrain initiative and create irresponsibility for the state of collective farming. Furthermore, the authors of such "valuable instructions" bear no responsibility for their results.

If the Kolkhoz Model Statutes would include only stipulations of general import, applicable to all kolkhozes, all individual explanations could be provided as footnotes. In drafting its own statutes the kolkhoz would accept such clarifications for information purposes only, without making them part of the document itself.

The draft stipulates that "The kolkhoz is a school of communism for the peasantry." Taking into consideration past and present experience in kolkhoz development and the actual situation, this stipulation should be deleted from the Model Statutes. Quite regretfully, so far it has not only failed to become "a school of communism" (an appeal included in the current Kolkhoz Model Statutes as well), but even simply a **cooperative enterprise of a truly socialist type**. For all practical purposes the kolkhoz members are not the masters of their enterprise and the most important concepts governing such an enterprise have not been observed in full. Furthermore, we must bear in mind that under the new economic management conditions all socialist enterprises will be basing their activities on the same principles which govern the kolkhozes (full cost accounting, self-support, self-financing, participation of every member of the collective in enterprise management), etc.

The Model Statutes must describe the nature of the kolkhoz. They should not tell the kolkhoz the way it should farm and formulate far-fetched restrictions, but stipulate that "the kolkhoz is a cooperative." In that case the Model Statutes would include the general stipulations which govern the activities of any cooperative. V.I. Lenin did not claim that the kolkhoz is a school of communism. He wrote that socialism is a system of civilized members of cooperatives. The kolkhoz should not be different from any other type of cooperative. Some differences may exist, but the main legislative document, the kolkhoz statutes, should describe only the general status of this specific kind of cooperative and only that.

It is very important to include in the statutes stipulations governing relations between the kolkhoz and the state, relative to land use. Nothing good will come out of all this unless we introduce major changes in this matter.

The point is that the procedure of assigning land to the kolkhozes for indefinite use is the main legal foundation for all administrative methods in kolkhoz management.

Something else as well should be taken into consideration. The time is nearing when payments for the land will be introduced. Free use of the land cannot be combined with economic management methods. We must give serious thought to the law on land use, so that relations between the kolkhoz and the state concerning the land may assume the nature of a lease. This, incidentally, would also clarify the status of cooperative farmers who leave the kolkhoz.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

#### Need for Mutual Responsibility

18020010k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Mar 88) p 103

[Article by G. Lych, department head, BSSR corresponding member; comment on the Kolkhoz Model Statutes]

[Text] The draft Kolkhoz Model Statutes were discussed by the Department of Socialist Agrarian Problems of the BeSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics. Numerous suggestions were made, substantially complementing the text of the draft.

It would be desirable, the speakers noted, for the Model Statutes to include a separate item granting the kolkhoz the right to refuse obligations to supply goods the production of which entails a loss under existing natural and economic conditions. Without such a right the kolkhozes would be forced to sell to the state products grown at a loss and may find themselves under circumstances preventing them from working normally. If such goods are vital to the state, the latter should take a number of steps which would ensure profitable production.

The kolkhoz should also have the right to file claims against superior officials to recover damages it has suffered as a result of implementing economically unsubstantiated instructions.

The draft Kolkhoz Model Statutes do not describe with adequate precision and consistency the nature of relations between public and private auxiliary farms, although they indicate an indisputably accurate overall trend toward strengthening production ties and economic relations between the two agricultural sectors. It is precisely from this viewpoint that we deem it inexpedient for the Model Statutes to stipulate that the nature of the auxiliary plots must be different from that of public-use land (see Point 8). Incidentally, as is the case in a number of Belorussian kolkhozes most the the private plots are treated like public use land in terms of crop

rotation. This facilitates the solution of several problems: it becomes easier for the kolkhoz to help private plots with mechanization in crop cultivation and harvesting. This enables the kolkhoz member to grow a better crop compared to single crop growing on his plot, with lesser physical strain. As a rule this could not be accomplished if private plots are to be of a nature different from the public land.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Socialist Revolution and the Individual; Notes of a Historian**

180200101 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 104-114

[Article by Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kozlov, senior scientific associate, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of USSR History, candidate of historical sciences]

[Text] All great revolutions begin with generally simple things, such as the unwillingness of the working person to tolerate oppression and exploitation, the impossibility of living as in the past, the need for justice, freedom and equality and optimistic hopes for the future. The rank-and-file participants in a socialist revolution do not quickly realize that their revolution is not a one-time act of seizure of political power by the proletariat but "long birth pains," as a result of which a new society appears. The profound changes which take place in the consciousness of the people are both a prerequisite and a result of revolutionary change. However, for many long years most works on the history of Soviet society virtually concealed behind the screen of the "iron march of history" the living person who makes the revolution and for the sake of which, in the final account, the revolution is made.

It is impossible to understand this person outside of his social relations and ties. However, nor should professional historians ignore the individual wealth of the historical process for, as Lenin wrote, the idea of determinism, "while rejecting the stupid fable of free will does not destroy in the least the mind or conscience of the individual nor the assessment of his actions... All of history consists precisely of the actions of individuals who are, unquestionably, active personalities" (*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*) [Complete Collected Works], vol I, p 159).

The study of the expedient activities of the people—the creators and makers of the new society (in this case we are referring to activities as a subject of special studies which require new approaches and methods; generally speaking, historical science has been dealing with this problem ever since it was created)—remains limited in our country to the history of the implementation of political and economic decisions. Usually historical summations, the structure of which, for the time being,

seems to us to be the only possible one, include man as the main productive force of society, treated as "the masses," "cadres" or "manpower." It is only somewhere toward the end of a fundamental work that individual problems of the spiritual aspect of such "cadres" come to the fore, frequently reduced to the level of strictly "cultural-education" problems.

It seemed, only recently, that this was precisely the right way to proceed, that such a partiality in the interpretation of the past cannot be taken as a charge leveled at professional historiography, that this was its innate feature and not an accepted shortcoming. Today an increasing number of historians are beginning to think otherwise. Obviously, the time has come to speak of kind of "fatigue of form" of traditional works on the history of Soviet society, ranging from multiple-volume academic works to secondary school textbooks. Why conceal it, we have become accustomed to such style of writing and it frequently seems to us that no other forms of interpretation are possible. Yet there is a kind of invisible tie between the system we have uncritically accepted and concepts of socialism and the hierarchy of the social problems which were being solved in the 1930s, the time when this system developed. Contemporary practice demands a different vision of historical problems and another organization of factual data or, in short, the need to turn to man not only in economics and politics but also in the knowledge of the past.

May my colleagues forgive me for this self-critical assessment but, as a rule, professional historiography is boring. It is not a question of any shortage of "sharp quills" or of people with literary talent among us. Clearly, the main feature lies elsewhere, namely the following: in works on history the simple thought that "nonetheless wheat is raised for people and people do not live for the sake of raising it," has not always been adequately expressed. As was aptly remarked as early as 1947 by K. Simonov one cannot "make out of people some appendages to the work they do, deprived of any other feelings." To do this would be wrong, he said in winding up his thought, and the people do not wish to read such things about themselves. Is this not the "secret" of the low popularity of the majority of books on the history of Soviet society?

Unless historical science learns to see (or, more accurately, learns to perceive) the living people of the past, people whose activities precisely made history, and if history continues to perceive the historical process as the depersonalized development of socioeconomic and political structures, we are doomed to stand still. There would be neither "the entire truth" of the past nor real perestroika in the historiography of Soviet society, and the concept of the "human factor" would hardly assume any specific historical content and acquire its multidimensionality and historical depth which are so greatly needed.

Unquestionably, works which were written in the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s included critical assessments of the effectiveness of some decisions and actions and

the social consequences of the political and economic changes which had taken place in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. What was almost entirely lacking was an effort to make conscious use of the integral indicator of the historical progress of society which, to the communists, has always been man himself. Socialist humanism was present in our studies as a kind of set of prescribed formulas and general statements but not as a criterion of the progress made by socialist society on the level of a specific historical analysis. Nonetheless we are well familiar with Marx's views on the communist system as a turn "of man toward himself, as a social person, i.e., as a human," taking place on a conscious basis and while preserving the entire wealth of previous human developments (K. Marx and F. Engels, "*Soch*" [Works], vol 42, p 116). Marx equated such communism with humanism, for which reason he spoke of communism as being "practical humanism" (see *ibid.*, p 169). Naturally, it is not a question of quotations, however authoritative they may be to us, but of the essence of the problem. The essence is that real history is made by people (in the entire wealth of their socioclass characteristics), obeying the objective laws of social development and steadily expanding the "space" for the activities and self-realizing of the individual.

Let us assume that we have been able to turn humanism into a working criterion of the progress of socialist society and, on this basis, broaden the cognitive possibilities of historical science. In such a case what changes would take place in traditional historical narration? Above all, a new central meaning would appear around which the actual data would be concentrated—the humanizing of social relations and the spiritual liberation of the individual. Obviously, a new "formula" for a fundamental work on history would appear. The traditional "spheres" of historical knowledge (economics, politics, the socioclass structure and cultural building) would appear in such a fundamental study from a new angle, consistent, so to say, with human dimensions. The results of the specific historical study of such "spheres," to resort to philosophical terminology, would be "laid in the foundations" of historical summations. The traditional barriers between the "spheres" would be thus eliminated. The objective of social progress under socialism—man—which has always been poorly fitted in traditional systems would in this case become an organic part of the integral picture of the historical process as a "conscious historical personality." The fundamental works of historians would be focused, first of all, on the process of the maturing of social contradictions and their reflection in the awareness of the masses, as hard to detect sociopsychological changes and as social tasks and internal concepts which require practical action and, secondly, as ways of coordinating the purposeful activities of people, leading not to a social reality free from contradictions but to new contradictions which become the sources of the further advancement toward "practical humanism."

This concept may seem remote from current problems and the sensitive matters related to our past, which are

affecting our contemporaries. Actually, it is precisely many of these prickly problems, including those which deal with the history of the transitional period in the USSR, that cannot be treated frontally and that nontraditional approaches must be adopted in order to answer them.

### The Moral Assessment of the Past as a Problem of Historical Knowledge

The use of a humanistic criterion of social progress would enable the science of history to approach one of the most important problems of historical knowledge in general, the history of the transitional period in particular, as a problem of the moral assessment of the past, for the systematic implementation of the class principles of the approach to historical phenomena, which exclude the transfer of "petit bourgeois concepts of morality to the proletariat" (V.I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, vol 34, p 13) not only does not indicate a rejection of the moral criticism of the past but, conversely, presumes it. Particularly important to the historian is the question of the consistency between the content of the economic and political solutions and their practical implementation and the tasks related to the moral development of society, the spiritual progress of the individual, the moral consequences of one error or blunder or another, and the moral "imprints" remaining in the awareness of the modern man from violations of socialist principles committed in the past.

Let us admit that historians jointly and even purposefully avoid precisely such assessments in their works. Why? In private life, in their daily contacts, like all people, they have civic feelings and constantly turn precisely to the moral assessments of past events. Obviously, it is not that historians are not affected by moral problems. Rather, it is a fact that we have still not learned how to formulate such problems in the language of historical science. Disparate concepts of "good" and "evil" in our historical past are unquestionably of interest and have a right to exist. However, the one-dimensionality of assessments which is mandatory in the ordinary awareness, and not only in it but, partially, in the area of practical policy, of "good" or "bad" (otherwise it would be generally impossible to make decisions and indecisiveness would remain the eternal monument of mankind stopped in its development) frequently leads us to a dead end in the scientific and, therefore, the dialectical assessment of invariably controversial historical events. The efforts to come out of such a dead end (on the one hand, good; on the other, bad) have long stopped to satisfy either our readers or ourselves. Scientific evaluations as well need a simple interpretation but on a different level, if one may say so, a dialectical simplicity which would contain in its clear aspect knowledge of the contradictions within social development, contradictions which had led to the appearance of one moral problem or another.



The science of history has a general sociological criterion for making a scientific distinction between "good" and "evil" in the development of society, which allows it to translate moral criteria into the language of the concepts of the historical knowledge of the past. If "good" and "evil" are the foundations of the moral evaluation of historical events, the principle of humanism, which considers man as "the measure of all things" and is conceived in a state of unbreakable unity with the class criteria of the historical progress becomes a self-sufficing criterion for distinguishing between these concepts and a foundation on the basis of which the choice made by society is evaluated.

Several ideas which Engels expressed in his time should be considered in connection with the problem of the moral assessment of the past. Specifically, they applied to the antagonistic systems but the very principle used in their approach is of broader general significance as well. It is a question above all of Engels' indication that "moral indignation," and appeals "from obsolete facts to the so-called eternal justice" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 20, p 153) are always symptoms of the obsolescence of social forms. This thought provides an additional criterion for general sociological evaluations. It enables us, for example, to look differently at the abandonment of the "traditional" NEP at the end of the 1920s. The ease with which a turn was made to administrative-command and rushing methods of building socialism is explained, in addition to everything else, also by the growth of the "moral indignation" and the aggravated perception of the distorted aspects of the NEP among the working class and the growing disillusionment of the poorest peasantry with private farming.

The same criterion should be applied also to the assessment of the outlay-based economy which developed in the 1930s. This problem has not been the subject of special studies. For the time being, all we have is a pile of quite contradictory facts. Most of the proof of the events of the second half of the 1930s indicates a relative satisfaction with the then extant economic system with its socioeconomic guarantees and absence of unemployment. However, subsequent retrospective views expressed by the contemporaries do not share the same type of simplicity. Without emphasizing any unquestionable priority of some testimony as compared to another, it is an obvious fact that this problem needs a serious study. It is time to answer the question of when and in what form did the outlay economy begin to trigger a "moral indignation," a sociopsychological symptom of the pre-crisis phenomena which afflicted it.

Naturally, an age of social change cannot be judged merely on the basis of self-awareness. Moral assessments of the contemporaries, however, and the subjective perception of one historical phenomenon or process or another, is a characteristic indicator which should not be neglected in any serious socioeconomic study, for it is a direct indication of the internal feelings and motivations governing the activities of the main productive force of

society—man. The study of the correlation between man within a certain period of time and the specific historical form of realization of socialist social relations, the focal point of which man is, would unquestionably intensify historical knowledge and enable us to amend certain assessments.

The concepts of "good" and "evil" are historically concrete. The moral assessment of the past in a historical study should combine within itself present moral criteria with the principle of historicism and a view of history "from the viewpoint of those who make it, and who lack the possibility of impeccably establishing in advance its chances, rather than from the viewpoint of the philistine intellectual who moralizes that "it would have been easy to predict... that one should not have undertaken..." (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 14, p 379).

I would like to draw attention to yet another important and pressing problem. The forms of moral evaluation of the past which are being actively used today in art and political journalism cannot be directly and unconditionally transferred to the science of history. Naturally, to both the artist and the historian "the entire truth" is the same concept. However, in the course of reproducing this "entire truth," art and science apply their own specific methods. On this subject, Engels wrote that "the anger which makes the poet is entirely appropriate." However, it is of little importance "as proof in each specific case" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 20, p 153). This does not mean at all, naturally, that we are calling upon the historian to "indifferently heed" "good" and "evil" in the study of our past. It is simply that science has its own ways of expressing "moral indignation," which are not emotional exposures or lamentations but the merciless exposures of the roots of the "evil," and an indication of the possible ways through which it could be avoided or diminished.

#### **Social Revolution as 'Space' for the Self-Assertion of the Individual**

The principle of socialist humanism enables us to assess past phenomena and events and social development trends from the viewpoint of the self-realization of the human individual and the space available for the individual's activities. In that sense revolutions—despite the entire bloodshedding and fierceness of the struggle—become profoundly humanistic acts, for it is a question of the social and spiritual liberation of the individual.

The stormy social cataclysms created by man inevitably assume a tremendous inner significance to him, making him particularly receptive to anything occurring under his own eyes and creating the psychological need for a conscious changing of his own self in order to be consistent with the headlong pace of events and have the opportunity of influencing them. In the opposite case a degrading sensation of "a split" develops in man, introduced by a strange and alien social current. The "fear of

life" and social confusion which arise on such grounds can be compensated with an orientation toward a once-chosen authority only partially.

In the process of the radical disruption of the old world a sharp conflict between the concept of life develops under the old circumstances and the new revolutionary reality becomes inevitable. This contradiction—the source of the fast growth of the individual—“appears” after the previous conceptual model can no longer provide an explanation of the new reality, and the results anticipated on its basis diverge from reality. The revolution triggers a crisis in the traditional interpretation of the world in millions of people, as well as objective prerequisites for their fast spiritual growth. A particular type of personality becomes crystallized within the mass of “conscious makers of history,” a personality who does not fear change, who is oriented toward change and who has development possibilities. The new ideals and ideas shared by such people, extracted not from books or newspapers but from life itself, and the knowledge, which is part of their personality, of the fact that reality could be flexible and that “anything can be changed,” and a heroic perception which sees no limits to revolutionary conscious activities make them much more independent of the influences of moods and immediate material interests and raise them above the circumstances. In revolutionary periods of social development, “millions and tens of millions of people learn every week more in a week than in a year of ordinary slumbering life” (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 34, p 55). It is as though their impressions, which are transformed into their convictions, lead to greater stability and internal independence. All of this allows the representatives of the revolutionary vanguard truly to influence the situation. The entire field of revolutionary struggle of the transitional period becomes the “space” within which such a personality can develop.

The individualistically-oriented type of personality is the complete opposite of the conscious representative of the revolutionary vanguard. Actually, this applies not only to those who deliberately adopt egotistical positions but also to those who “do not think or are unable to think,” people who exist “whatever the class, and even under the conditions of the most enlightened country and even at the most progressive and, by virtue of the circumstances of the time, exceptionally high upsurge of all spiritual forces” (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 41, pp 52-53).

An inordinate variety of forms of personality exists between the two opposites—the conscious workers and peasants, on the one hand, and the bearers of philistine, petit-bourgeois concepts, on the other. Such differences are determined by the different extent to which people become involved in conscious historical creativity. In revolutionary periods of social development the particular, the mass-type personality which, by its very nature is in itself transitional, becomes widespread. Its manifestation is related to the exceptionally fast shift to direct participation in the country's political life by people

who, under ordinary circumstances, are not guided by any firm outlook, who swim along with the current, blindly yielding to the prevailing mood (see V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 14, p 202). The involvement of such people in conscious activities in structuring the state was considered by Lenin one of the main features of “any true revolution” (see op. cit., vol 31, p 156).

The values and standards of the new developing culture, sanctioned and supported by the authority of the state, are initially external in terms of the “former petit bourgeois.” The person by this time realizes quite clearly what is “good” and what is “bad” from the viewpoint of the new standard. At the same time, however, he experiences the internal pressure of the old views and concepts which, as in the past, largely define his daily behavior.

In the final account, any effort at solving ideological problems, which arise on this basis, through the use of repressive measures proves to be inefficient. The point is that the very “duality” of the transitional type of personality allows it, whenever there is a threat of violence and punishment, easily to amend any demonstrative behavior, to “withdraw into its shell,” actually without changing any views or life stance. As a result, the contradictions of the spiritual life in the transitional period are simply pushed deep inside the person without being entirely solved and, under a given set of circumstances, emerge once again on the surface. Ideological problems can be solved only through ideological methods; one cannot force a person to change his convictions. One can only force him not to express such convictions outloud.

Obviously, the system of ideological “prohibitions,” to which society is forced to turn during the transitional period, should be treated differently. Such prohibition become harsher the greater the threat exists that the “culture of the defeated” would turn out to be stronger than the “culture of the victors.” However, the realm of action of such a “prohibition” system gradually becomes restricted to an ever-narrower range of problems as the ideological “immunity” of socialist culture increases.

The rigid forms to which society has occasionally resorted to regulate behavior could be explained by the gravity of the class struggle during the transitional period, the extremal situation prevailing in building socialism in a single country under circumstances of capitalist encirclement. However, here as well the need and expediency of such steps should be assessed in accordance with the measures of socialist humanism: they are mandatory and inevitable in the case of a resisting and consciously acting class enemy but, naturally, can in no case replace the re-education of those who have been innocently misled or convince those who vacillate.

Particularly important in understanding this problem is the Leninist criterion of the legitimacy of coercion within the revolutionary camp: in terms of workers and peasants, coercion is effective only when it is founded on the "basis of persuasion" (see op. cit., vol 42, pp 216-217). Any broadening of the realm of coercion beyond such clearly defined limits and efforts at total control in the spirit of "barracks communism" have meant restricting the "space" needed for the free development of the individual and have contradicted the principle of socialist humanism. The unjustified hopes of solving production problems on this basis have in general not yielded nor could yield any long-term effect.

"The harshness of the times," the "cruelty of the age," and the "extreme nature of the situation" had, naturally, an objective origin: they were created by the gravity of the class contradiction of the transitional period. In September 1921 S. Danilov, an old Bolshevik, wrote Lenin the following: "During the time of the revolution... hatred of the oppressor played a positive role as well: it was a lever which motivated millions to rise to the struggle against the bourgeoisie... Under the circumstances of a fierce civil war, hunger and need and severe privations, there was little place for altruism and love, even within the class, among the working people... I am far from the thought that the time has come for us to reforge our bayonets into scythes and sickles. However, I believe that the time has already come to call for love, compassion and mutual aid within the class, within the camp of the working people." Lenin's answer to this address was short but absolutely unequivocal: "It is absolutely necessary to develop both 'within the class' and the working people of other classes a feeling of 'mutual aid,' etc." (op. cit., vol 53, p 187).

In the 1920s the situation in the country continued to remain quite stressed. However, the increased interest in problems of communist morality, party ethics and the new way of life confirmed the existence of a trend toward easing the "harshness" in relations among people "within the class," which had developed during the time of the revolution and the civil war. In the 1930s, when unjustified mass repressions were inflicted on "one's own," the process came to a halt. There was a retreat in a number of views, a backward movement, the moral and psychological consequences of which are as yet to be studied.

#### **The Social Psychology of the Transitional Period: Where Does Authority End and the Cult of Personality Begin?**

The party began the building of socialism with the "human material" which was left over by capitalism in a country in which "the urban proletariat was in the minority and where the peasant majority, accustomed to farming individually, was thoroughly imbued with such customs of isolated farming" (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 38, p 61). The peasantry, the main ally of the proletariat in the revolution, both owner and worker, brought into the

revolutionary process not exclusively the better side of its dual nature." This determined the specific complexity of the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country and the intensified dramatic nature of the historical situation which Lenin described as follows: "We alone will come out of it, without anyone else's help" (op. cit., vol 45, p 432). The extreme nature of the situation in which this country of petty peasant farming found itself, a country which had entered the path of socialism, urgently raised the question of the danger of a combination of conditions under which the domination of a class and the unity of its political power could develop into a "personal regime." The potential for the growth of the authority of a leader into a cult of his personality was a sociopsychological aspect of this general sociological problem triggered by the petty-peasant nature of Russia and its cultural backwardness.

In Lenin's words, the Soviet state stumbled over the problem of the inadequate cultural standards of the masses from the very first years of the revolution (see op. cit., vol 38, p 171). The ignorance and illiteracy of the masses, the multi-million strong peasantry above all, had always been used as an explanation of many events in Russian political life both before and after the revolution. This "ignorance" should not be conceived, as is sometimes done by some researchers, merely as synonymous with lack of education, narrowness of outlook and a low amount of knowledge. Actually, it is an intrinsic feature of the spiritual enslavement of the individual and his inability to make decisions beyond the range of ordinary daily concerns. This type of thinking limited the possibilities of the individual to achieve a multidimensional perception of the world, the ability to see his own activities within a broad social context and a time period. This inevitably stimulated the aspiration, in the case of complex situations which required the need for a single choice, blindly to follow the authority and to rely on instructions "from above," from where "everything is more clearly visible."

In itself, the attraction for authority is to a certain extent inherent in all participants in a revolution, for it ensures the unity of action needed to achieve victory and helps the individual to orient himself in current events. However, from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint what is particularly inadmissible is to instill in the ranks of the fighting proletariat the mentality of the "leader-principle," which is inherent in the petit-bourgeois mind. The particular gravity of this problem was due to the fact that the cultural underdevelopment of the country in this sense contributed to the "belittling" of the Soviet system "which in principle led to a much higher proletarian democracy" (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 38, p 165) and to the restoration of bureaucratic trends. It was precisely the petit-bourgeois "leader-principle" that combined and, in a peculiar way, interacted precisely with the interests of the restored bureaucracy, a social force to which authority is a principle of knowledge and its deification a way of thinking (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 1, p 272).



The mentality of the "leader-principle" and the bureaucratic "deification of authority" in a country in which the overwhelming majority of the population consisted of peasants, already contain within themselves the possibility of the cult of personality without, however, fatally leading to its establishment. Their effect was blocked by the proletarian nature of the ruling communist party which was capable of opposing distortions triggered by a petit-bourgeois spirit. The main risk factor, in this case, was, as Lenin wrote in March 1922, the fact that "the party's proletarian policy is determined not by its composition but by the tremendous, the unchallenged authority of that extremely thin stratum which could be described as the old party guard." He emphasized that "a minor internal struggle within this stratum would suffice for its authority, if not to become undermined, in any case to be weakened to such an extent that it could no longer make decisions" (op. cit., vol 45, p 20).

Subsequent events developed in accordance with Lenin's prediction and warning. The authority of the "old guard" was weakened and its realm of influence on the formulation of political decisions was narrowed. Between the end of the 1920s and beginning of the 1930s the effect of these factors was enhanced by the worsening of the international situation, the aggravation of the class struggle and the gradual exhaustion of the possibilities of the "traditional" NEP to ensure accelerated industrialization. The majority of party members reached the conclusion that rigid centralization and intensified administrative instruments of management and strengthening party unity in the face of growing difficulties were strictly needed. This turn in politics was to contribute to the solution of the most important problems of the accelerated building of socialism. At the same time, however, it restricted even further the possibility of the "old guard" to influence the choice of methods for reaching the set objectives.

The objectively necessary broadening of the realm of action of administrative instruments concealed a potential threat which many party members realized. As M.I. Kalinin said as early as 1925, "administrative orders are based to a considerable extent on the individual qualities of the administrator... The essence of evil in the right of the administrator resides not in the abuse of this power by people but the fact that such a power, for entirely understandable reasons, assumes the features of the administrator himself... That is why the administrative power is granted in significant amounts only in exceptional circumstances..." However, at that time it proved impossible to provide an efficient democratic "counterweight" to such dangerous trends.

In the extreme situation of the turn of the 1930s, against a background of a mass influx of workers and peasants in the party, brimming with revolutionary enthusiasm and loyal to the cause of socialism but insufficiently developed politically and culturally, inevitably a "direct action mentality," a straight line of judgments, a rigid

perception of life, an orientation toward an expedient use of power, a black-and-white vision of the world, an attraction for "simple indicators" in the class evaluation of social phenomena and the simplified and frequently slogan-oriented mastery of communist ideas inevitably intensified among the party members. This "limitation" of "conscious historical personalities" triggered by the age (historical limitation precisely, which has nothing in common with the ordinary understanding of this word) was the inevitable result of exceptional circumstances. Within the ranks of the party itself it broadened the nutritive grounds for the shaping of the cult of personality.

By virtue of his personal characteristics, J.V. Stalin seemed to encompass this entire system of elements, conditions and prerequisites within himself. As a result, the mentality of the "leader-principle" and the "way of thinking" of the bureaucrat, which is the "deification of authority," developed into the ideology and practice of the cult of personality (let us parenthetically note that historians are as yet to determine the point at which Stalin's true qualities indeed came to an end, such as love of power and intolerance, and subjectivistic distortions of objectively necessary actions began).

The incompatibility between the cult of personality and socialism is obvious. It creates a special form of spiritual self-alienation of man. That is why it is only the elimination of the cult of personality as a distorted form of interrelationship between man and the authority—petit bourgeois in terms of origin—that can result in laying the spiritual foundations for socialism and the full identification of its humanistic potential. We must not forget in this case that by no means were all "conscious historical personalities" of the 1930s bearers of this "alienated" "cult" awareness. Nor did it assume the forms of extreme fanaticism in the majority of the people. In no way should the cult of personality be considered the summed-up characterization of the socialist social consciousness of the 1930s but rather a distorted, an alien growth on it.

The humanistic tradition of socialist culture was preserved. What is of essential significance to us is the question of the "mechanism" which opposed and partially blocked the destructive influence of the cult of personality on the minds of the people. It is indicative, for example, that after the 1937-1938 events, which were tragic in Soviet history, and which drastically worsened the moral and political climate of society and had weakened the country, (under the pressure of protests heard within the party) the 18th VKP(b) Congress criticized some aspects of the developed political practice (in particular indiscriminate expulsion from the party on the basis of ties with "enemies of the people") without, however, naming the true culprits.

Nor should we underestimate the counteraction of the old party guard to the developing political practice and the struggle waged by the party members for the preservation of the socialist ideals. It would be expedient to

formulate on a more general level the problem of the "positive inertia" in culture and the question of the ways and means of the establishment of the humanistic principles in the socioeconomic structures, the social consciousness and the spiritual structure of the individual. If we are to tell the "full truth" about our prewar history, the main feature will be precisely that of depicting the strength of the opposition mounted by the party and the people to this new social evil which, in the final account, led to the resolutions passed at the 20th CPSU Congress.

#### **The Meaning of Life of the 'Conscious Historical Personality' During the Transitional Period**

The severe trials experienced by those who lived, struggled and worked during the transitional period, such as the bloodshedding battles of the civil war, dislocation, hunger, limitation of personal needs, violations of socialist legality and breakdowns in collectivization, all of this, correlated with today's ordinary concepts and ideas, create in some of our contemporaries a very dark picture of the spiritual feelings of the people, particularly in the 1930s. It even begins to seem to some people that during the first decades of the Soviet system this was the only concern of the people who tolerated, experienced, "clenched their teeth" and "looked toward the future." Naturally, this is a very one-sided view which belittles the significance of the changes which took place.

According to documentary proof, the "conscious historical personalities" did not view the subordination of the individual to the public interest as some kind of "framework" narrowing their development. The majority of them felt quite at ease within such a "framework." In order to explain this seemingly paradoxical phenomenon, we should turn to the problem which, only 10 years ago might have seemed far-fetched or even "not serious" to a Soviet social historian. This applies to the ways of surmounting the fear of death and the meaning of life by people in a socialist society.

Of late a number of new ideas have been expressed in sociology, philosophy and literature on the nature and features of the collectivistic man of the transitional period. Heroism, dedication and enthusiasm were considered a specific form of realization of the needs of the daily life of the individual. This is not astounding. For example, on the eve of the new shift in the development of the Soviet society, for example, toward the end of the 1920s, some psychologists began to say that man cannot withstand the tremendous stress and overload (for it was precisely in the 1920s that the expression of "burnout on the job" appeared), the noted psychologist A. Zalkind also pointed out an essentially new "health factor"—the attraction to social creativity.

The active participants in the revolution and the building of socialism, to whom a heightened perception of the ideas of socialism was inherent as a "common monument," as the unique opportunity of "leaving a mark" in the world, were able to retain the condition of spiritual

upsurge and to apply all their forces for quite a long period of time. This was the source of the moral firmness of the communist vanguard. The trials experienced by the party and the people during the transitional period were withstood not by postponing joys for the future (although many joys had indeed to be postponed for the future) but with the help of a different sociopsychological mechanism: the feeling of a meaningful, albeit difficult, life which, for the first time in history, became accessible not only to individual intellectual units but to vast popular strata.

Even during the transitional period socialist culture offers to the individual a qualitatively new principle of blending with the social objectives and acquiring a meaningful life and "leaving a mark" in the world—the principle of collectivism. This is the only foundation for the true harmony between the individual and society, thus ensuring the combination between an individual life, which comes to an end, and the endless existence of society. The specific historical content of such profound sociopsychological processes remains for the time being entirely untouched by the science of history and it is precisely in this area that we should expect in the immediate future a historiographic "breach" into a subject new to the historians.

The people of the revolutionary age are always present both as an instrument reading and as a base for comparison in the moral quest of the modern man and in his aspiration to find his place in the world, to realize and explain his qualities and imperfections. We bear within ourselves their spiritual experience, errors, disappointments and dramas. We carry with us the memory of the starry hours of our historical predecessors, their ideals and their social optimism. The revolutionary renovation of socialist society, which is taking place under our very eyes and with our participation, is the starry hour of the present generation. Perestroika continues the humanistic tradition of the October Revolution. It begins with man, with the "mark" of the confidence within himself of the possibility for and inevitable advance forward.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

#### **Socialism and Religion**

18020010m Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 115-123

[Text] On 20 January (2 February) 1918 the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars passed a decree on the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church. The decree became official after it was published in the official organ of the government, *GAZETA RABOCHEGO I KRESTYANSKOGO PRAVITELSTVA*, on 23 January. As of then, for the past 70 years, this decree has been the foundation for the laws which govern the nature of the relationship between the

Soviet system and religious associations. Its essential sociohistorical significance is particularly clear today, under the conditions of perestroika and democratization of the socialist society.

The Soviet people are showing a most lively interest in the history of our culture and the role which the Orthodox Church played in it, as well as in the place which religion holds in the contemporary spiritual life of our society. Unquestionably, this interest is enhanced by the approaching date—the one thousandth anniversary of the proclamation of Christianity in Rus as the state religion. In the post-October period the status of the church was changed substantially and its social concepts have evolved. At the same time, materialistic views became widespread and a system of scientific-atheistic education was organized. The understanding of the sociopolitical principles and the ideological-cultural foundations for the decree, and the study of the experience acquired in its practical implementation are still helping us better to clarify the nature of the complex and multidimensional relations between socialism and religion. In drafting the decree, V.I. Lenin relied on the age-old humanistic traditions of world culture, the experience of the revolutionary legislation passed by the Paris Commune and the ideological legacy of the founders of scientific communism. At the dawn of their sociopolitical activities, K. Marx and F. Engels had decisively shown their opposition to the "police" state religion and the efforts to turn Christianity into a "cult... of personal unrestricted power and governmental wisdom" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "*Soch.*" [Works], vol 1, p 13). They formulated their own program for an attitude toward religion and the church, which reflected the class interests of the proletariat. "...The bourgeois 'freedom of conscience' is nothing other," Marx wrote in his "*Critique of the Gotha Program*," "than tolerance of any possible types of religious freedom of conscience," and "conversely, the workers' party tries to free the mind from religious dope" (op. cit., vol 19, p 30).

This approach was creatively developed by Lenin in terms of Russia's specific conditions. In the program which was adopted at the 2nd RSDWP Congress (1903) one of the immediate political tasks, among others, was the struggle for the implementation of democratic demands—unrestricted freedom of conscience, total equality of citizens, regardless of sex, religion, race and nationality, and the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church.

Nonetheless, Lenin pointed out, the "alliance among the conscientious and front-ranking fighters for the liberation of the working class... cannot and must not remain indifferent to unconsciousness, ignorance or obscurantism presented in the guise of religious beliefs" ("*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*" [Complete Collected Works], vol 12, p 145; subsequent references to V.I. Lenin's Complete Collected Works indicate volume and page only). He cautioned, furthermore, that the Communist Party should not "adopt an abstract, an idealistic formulation of the

religious problem 'based on sense,' outside the class struggle" (ibid., p 146). The attitude toward religion should be subordinated to the main task of the proletariat, which is the elimination of the exploiting system. That is why under Russia's historical conditions at the beginning of the 20th century, Lenin opposed including in the program categorical requirements of atheism, which threatened discord and the weakening of revolutionary forces.

After the February revolution the Provisional Government, which had proclaimed freedom of religion in words only, retained the privileged status of the Orthodox Church, entrusting the final solution of the problem of its relationship with the state to the Church itself, to the synod which opened on 15 August 1917. Another problem which was not solved was that of church land ownership, which was one of the economic foundations of the ruling position of the Orthodox Church. A number of decrees and resolutions were passed in the first months after the October Revolution, which deprived the churches of their material power and privileged status. The January 1918 decree was a comprehensive legislative act. Lenin had made amendments and introduced supplements to its draft, which emphasized both the sociohistorical significance of the document as well as the real guarantees of freedom of conscience for the citizens of Soviet Russia.

After proclaiming the separation of the church from the state, the Soviet system granted the citizens the right to profess any religion or not to profess any; any restrictions of rights pertaining to religion and any limitations on the freedom of conscience were lifted; information on the religious affiliation of the citizens was deleted from all official documents; the religious oath of loyalty, or religious ceremonies in state acts were abolished; the civil authorities took over civil status records. The teaching of religion was abolished in all schools. Religious organizations were forbidden to collect mandatory tithes from believers or to impose any kind of coercion and penalties on them; it was pointed out that no one had the right to cite religious convictions as a reason for declining to fulfill his civic obligations. By virtue of this, the attitude toward religion was proclaimed to be the private affair of the citizens, and religious societies became private organizations receiving no subsidies whatsoever from the state.

The decree stipulated specific measures which offered the religious organizations the possibility of performing their functions. The free performance of religious ceremonies was guaranteed providing that they did not disturb the public order and did not violate civil rights. Religious societies were given the free use of buildings and objects needed for religious services. The entire reactionary segment of the clergy—Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Protestant, Muslim and Judaic—immediately opposed the decree. This was explained by the profound class ties which linked the higher clergy of all faiths to the expropriated bourgeoisie and the land owners, for the



decree applied to all faiths without exception. The freedom not to profess any religion was extended to all citizens of any nationality, regardless of their previous religious affiliation. However, the greatest opposition to the decree came from the reactionary circles of the clergy who had had a large material and economic base and had held the most privileged positions in the state.

The synod, which continued its work in 1918, stated: "The decree dated 23 January 1918 legitimizes the open persecution of the Orthodox Church and of all religious societies, both Christian and non-Christian."

Actually, the decree contained guarantees of the freedom for the church itself, relieving it from the performance of reactionary sociopolitical functions and granting it the opportunity, as Lenin said, to put an end to the shameful and accursed past when churches were the slaves of the state and the Russian citizens were the slaves of the state church..." (vol 12, p 144).

Having separated itself from the church, the state thus ended all interference in strictly religious matters. By proclaiming religion to be a private matter it did not proclaim itself and, in fact, was not an "atheistic state" which promoted anti-religious beliefs through political influence. Lenin categorically cautioned against the adventure of waging a political war on religion, which was radically conflicting with the spirit and letter of the decree. Addressing a meeting, on 26 July 1918, he said: "The Soviet Republic recognizes no religious differences. It remains outside of any religion and tries to separate religion from the Soviet state" (vol 36, p 536).

Since the requirements of the first party program concerning religion and the Church had been implemented, the new program, which was adopted by the 8th RKP(b) Congress (1919) set the following socialist task: The party, which is not satisfied with the decreed separation of the church from the state and the school from the church, "aspires toward a total break of relations between the exploiting classes and the organization of religious propaganda by promoting the actual liberating of the working masses from religious prejudices and organizing the broadest possible scientific-educational and anti-religious propaganda. In this case it is necessary carefully to avoid any insult to the feelings of believers, which can only lead to the strengthening of religious fanaticism."

Extensive work was undertaken for the implementation of these stipulations. Gradually the publication of a number of anti-religious works was organized. A beginning was laid to the Marxist study of fundamental historical and philosophical problems of religion, including ethnographic expeditions and sociological studies; the works of bourgeois students of religion were translated and a number of outstanding and talented specialists were trained.

The radical changes in society, which had taken place in the first decades following the October Revolution and, above all, the direct participation of millions of working people in building the new society, triggered a feeling of optimism and confidence in their own forces, mass labor enthusiasm and heroism and readiness for sacrifice and privations for the sake of the triumph of the ideals of socialism. Meanwhile, after the October Revolution, the church leadership assumed an open counterrevolutionary stance, anathemizing the new developments introduced by the Soviet system and, in a number of cases, directly participating in armed actions against it. In November 1917 the Synod elected as patriarch and as head of the church and the defender of its privileges, Moscow metropolitan Tikhon (V.I. Belavin), known for his links with the Black Hundred-Monarchic "Alliance of the Russian People."

By then the majority of the country's population had opted for breaking with religion. The range of conscious and convinced atheists widened. One of the outstanding features of that time was the mass anti-church movement, which was growing among the lower strata, particularly in peasant circles. It was an outlet for the hatred of the "slave owners in clerical robes," which had grown in the course of centuries, and also was manifested in engaging in destructive actions. It was not always possible to guide this movement down the path of consciousness. Furthermore, it frequently encouraged revolutionary impatience with its extreme leftist twists and administrative measures, "militant" exposures and "priest-bashing."

This was something which took place frequently, precisely on the grass-roots level. However, in the center as well some party and Komsomol workers considered "war on religion" as just about their main task. This position was characteristic, for example, of the first years of publication of the journal BEZBOZHNIK U STANKA. The 2nd All-Union Congress of the Godless, which was held in June 1929, unanimously condemned the left-wing twist in the organized anti-religious movement. However, practice had gone far beyond it and answers to problems raised by life had to be given to workers who lacked the necessary training and experience. The line of least resistance was established: some people considered administrative steps the shortest and most complete way of solving arising conflicts. A distorted concept was sinking roots, according to which each consistent supporter of religion was a covert and, in any case, a potential enemy of socialism. Such negative phenomena caused noticeable harm to the unity between believers and nonbelievers in building the new society and to the cause itself of the atheistic education of the working people.

Lenin and the party's Central Committee ascribed great importance to the strict adherence to the principles of freedom of conscience and the ideological struggle against religion. The 8th RKP(b) Congress, which emphasized the constitutional right of all citizens to total

freedom of religion, decreed the following: "...The congress draws attention to the total inadmissibility of any whatsoever restrictions of this right and of even a hint of violence in matters of religion. Individuals who violate the freedom of beliefs and religious services of citizens, whatever faith they may profess, must be strictly punished." The 12th Congress condemned the "deliberately rude methods, frequently practiced in the center and the local areas, and mockeries over objects of faith and cults," which "do not accelerate but hinder the liberation of the toiling masses from religious prejudices." The same thought is expressed in the resolution "On Work in the Countryside," which was adopted by the 13th Party Congress.

As the successful building of socialism continued, the necessary prerequisites were created for surmounting the distortions in the party line in the ideological struggle against religion. However, their implementation clashed with an insurmountable obstacle by the turn of the 1930s—in the situation which was developing on the basis of the cult of Stalin's personality.

The practice of bureaucratic administration of religion, which appeared in the first years of collectivization, was firmly condemned by the VKP(b) Central Committee which stipulated in one of its resolutions (1930) that "distortions of the party line in the area of the struggle against religious prejudices" were totally inadmissible. Nonetheless, this warning issued by the Central Committee produced no results. In some areas, the closing down of churches administratively and taking repressive measures against the clergy were frequently considered necessary elements of the socialist restructuring of the countryside. This was the grossest possible violation of the basic stipulations of the Communist Party in the field of atheistic work and a violation of the principles of the decree.

The atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust and "instructions" which were not to be criticized adversely affected the theory and practice of atheistic education. They led to the training of a type of worker who tended to solve all problems related to religion through "methods of force," and orders. Unwittingly, this damaged scientific religious studies, which took the path of uncritical justification of such practices. The creative approach which had existed in the study of the problems of religion gradually began to disappear in the 1930s; sociological studies were ignored and statistical data were either concealed or distorted and presented as "godless successes;" the enthusiasm of "research in depth" was replaced by victorious pseudoscientific reports to superiors. The existence of any whatsoever roots of religion in a society building socialism was rejected. Like crime and immorality, religion was entirely classified as a "vestige of capitalism." The attitude toward believers, church organizations and religious ideology stopped being differentiated: they were lumped together as something hostile, embraced within the single concept of "religion." However, even then many party members, members of the

public and local personnel, despite the risk they were taking of being accused of a severe crime, tried to prevent all sorts of distortions.

The situation drastically changed during the Great Patriotic War. It became obvious that pitting believers against nonbelievers and the lack of understanding (or unwillingness to do so) of the fact that the church could make a patriotic contribution to the struggle against the aggressors could only have an adverse effect on the struggle waged by the people against the Hitlerite aggressors.

The Orthodox Patriarchy was restored in 1943 and the Evangelical Baptist Christian Church was established in 1944-1945. Registered religious associations were given the possibility of engaging in normal daily activities. A number of problems related to providing material facilities for religious organizations were solved. The publication of religious works became regular and seminaries were opened.

The correction of the old deformations, however, led to a weakening of anti-religious propaganda. The Union of Militant Godless, which was disbanded in 1941, and which had 3 million members in 96,000 cells, was accepted by many people not as a change in the forms of anti-religious work but as a signal for its complete abolition.

The party's Central Committee passed a number of resolutions aimed against the distortion of religion and the church.

The party was forced frequently to correct the one-sided approach taken in work with believers and swings from one extreme to another. In July 1954 the CPSU Central Committee noted that scientific-atheistic propaganda—"the most important sector of ideological work is in a state of neglect," and demanded of the party authorities to enhance it. In November of that same year an expanded Central Committee resolution was adopted which categorically condemned the "gross errors" in scientific-atheistic propaganda and, in particular, "insulting attacks on the clergy and the believers practicing religious ceremonies," and depicting the clergy and the believers as people "undeserving of political trust," and "cases of administrative interference in the activities of religious associations and groups and a rude attitude toward the clergy." In 1960 the CPSU Central Committee reprimanded heads of party organizations "who practice a passive defensive position" toward "vestiges of the past in the awareness of the Soviet people" and religious prejudices.

The purpose of all of this was for relations between the state and the church to develop along the channel defined by Soviet law. A large number of churches and houses of prayer of a great variety of faiths were functioning. Religious leaders broadened their international relations, objectively assessed the status of religion in the

USSR at international fora and actively participated in peace-making activities. Through their sermons they called upon the believers to fulfill their civic duties and to work honestly.

However, the experience gained in the critical study of the theory and practice of scientific-atheistic work, which had yielded valuable results after the 20th and 22nd CPSU Congresses, were not subsequently developed and the positive changes which had occurred in this area were hindered during the period of stagnation. In the 1960s, for example, the number of cases of violating the decree and ignoring the wishes of the majority of believers, churches and religious associations, which were no longer registered with the state, became more frequent. The very procedure for the registration of religious associations, which frequently ended in refusals, became more complex.

Such occurrences were not accidental in spirit of the time. Increased demands for "favorable" reports found a common language with the bureaucratic concept that the state of religious faith and the dynamics of the number of believers directly depend on the willpower and energy of one manager or another. By virtue of this fact, local officials applied all kinds of steps to prevent the registration of religious associations which would "compromise" them.

Violations of legislation entailed subsequent violations: as a rule, believers continued to hold prayer meetings in secrecy while the local authorities applied administrative measures to prevent them. Naturally, such actions triggered protests and, occasionally, broke the ties which linked the religious feelings of believers to socialist values, and religious fanaticism increased. Open manifestations of extremism appeared in religious circles.

Today Soviet society has entered a new historical period in its development, a period of social renovation which extends to all areas of life. It is impossible to implement the tasks set by the party without taking maximally into consideration and enhancing the human, the individual factor and without ensuring the psychological and ideological support of perestroika.

Atheistic activities as well must be subject to radical restructuring. This work sector must be given a fresh look. We must critically review and reject obsolete stereotypes. In this case the criteria to be used are the national interests, upgrading the significance of universal values and the need for perestroika of the socialist society. We must take maximally into consideration also the situation which has developed today on a universal scale: the task of preventing a nuclear apocalypse and the solution of global ecological problems.

Many of the specific means of the perestroika are already clear today. We must cleanse our theory and practice from the legacy of circumstantial behavior, subjectivism and superficiality. We must continue to

improve our legislation and make the various legal documents and departmental acts consistent with the USSR Constitution and the requirements of the democratization of social life. The time has come to enhance the responsibility and authority of the soviets on religious matters. Their priority function is to protect the constitutional rights of both atheists and believers in solving eventual conflicts between the local authorities and religious associations, particularly on problems of registration and deregistration and other matters.

In short, the consistent implementation of the stipulations of the decree and of the Leninist principles of attitude toward religion as applicable to contemporary conditions are the foundations for the further development of theoretical research in religious studies and for scientific-atheistic educational work.

"We must struggle against religion," Lenin wrote. "This is the base of any materialism and, consequently, of Marxism. However, Marxism is not materialism left on its elementary stage. Marxism goes further" (vol 17, p 418). The fundamental conceptual and sociopolitical significance of this idea is unquestionable. Unfortunately, both during the period of the cult of personality and of stagnation, no less but even more than other social sciences, the study of religion felt the influence of dogmatism and formalism. As a rule, the authors of atheistic publications proceeded less on the basis of reality than of stereotyped concepts, failing to notice its complex and comprehensive clashes. They proceeded not on the basis of what was but of what one would have liked to see. As a result, the initiative in the creative formulation of the problems, dictated by practice, and in identifying the symptomatic changes and shifts in the religious situation, was gradually lost.

Naturally, it would be naive to explain such an adverse development merely in terms of the incompetence of individual authors. What was expected of scientific workers was not creative quests that the "consecration" of routine practices. Under the pretense of possible "undesirable" ideological consequences, for a long time books on scientific atheism remained an area closed to exigent criticism. The authors of works which were truly creative and profound had to wage a difficult struggle with publishers and reviewers.

As we evaluate as a whole the experience in the study of religious problems in the USSR and the shaping of atheistic convictions among the masses, it would be a grave error to ignore the real achievements of socialism in this area. We have something to base ourselves on in undertaking the revolutionary restructuring of society. To the credit of a substantial number of our scientists and party workers, despite difficult circumstances they were able to remain loyal to the Leninist behests in both science and propaganda. Today we cannot fail to remember the leading scientists in the area of religion and the propagandists of atheism, both party and nonparty members, including those who were victims of the



repressive measures of the 1930s. The main task today is to restore the artificially undermined tradition of the Leninist concepts of the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church, to struggle against religion exclusively through means of ideological persuasion and to enrich this struggle with the new historical experience and the latest scientific achievements.

Today the atmosphere in the country is changing radically. The need for all-round and conscientious study of contemporary socialist society has been realized to its fullest extent. The social scientists are facing the most responsible task of theoretically securing the restructuring process. Students of religion also face strict requirements. Let us look the truth in the face: today we are insufficiently informed about the status of religion and the church in our society.

Consequently, one of the key tasks now is the organization of a purposeful and professional study of the objective contradictions of socialist community life, the deformation of its ideological-moral development and the objective and subjective reasons for the same. It is equally important to understand the nature of the contemporary believer, the social function of currently active religious organizations and to explain the contemporary social reasons for the reproduction of religion, the more so since interest in it is found also in strata which were spiritually formed outside the realm of religious traditions.

The time has come to put an end once and for all to the suspicious and unsympathetic attitude toward believers and toward the ideals they profess, such as humaneness, love and moral self-advancement. We must remember that all human moral norms were initially expressed "circuitously" (Marx) in a religious form which, for its time in history, was natural. In the context of the secularized culture, the task is not to reject out of hand such ideals, but to explain to the believers their unwitting inconsistency and the inability adequately to express their aspirations and values. It is only a respectful attitude which could develop a conscious attitude on the part of many believers toward their civic duty and lead to their lively participation in molding the destinies of every person and readiness to come to the help of the near and dear.

The existence of millions of believers professing various religious beliefs is not an annoying blunder of history but reality. Our reality, not the one of books but the true one, is such as to warrant the existence of religious needs and, consequently, it is the churches that must satisfy them. That is why we must take into consideration the historically unprecedented circumstance that the church has been able to find its place in socialist society not by abandoning the study of religion or betraying the trust of believers or the state. For the first time in its history the

church has become an independent voluntary community concentrating on its direct religious functions. However, to be separated from the state does not mean to be separated from the life of society, from the complex and sharp problems which affect all of its citizens, both believers and unbelievers. For that reason the churches in the USSR are seeking within their own spiritual values concepts consistent with the humane ideals of socialism, displaying not only loyalty but also solidarity with the programmatic stipulations of Soviet society and proclaiming willingness to assist in their implementation and reflecting the interests of believing Soviet citizens.

The development of a scientific and efficient system of scientific-atheistic work calls for taking into consideration the specific nature of religion and its place in social awareness as a whole as well as in the conceptual views of the individual. To the believer religion is not a sum total of abstract dogmas about the secrets of the origin of the world. It is not simply an outlook. It is also a specific moral program, a "science of life," and a certain type of behavioral activity and attitude toward fellow coreligionists. It is also a spiritual status, the "holy of holies" of the inner world, and the sum total of rather intimate feelings and thoughts. Hence atheistic arguments which ignore the emotional aspect of life fail to achieve their objectives, however impeccable their logic might be. Activities related to the materialistic (including in their atheistic aspect as well) education and upbringing of the broad toiling strata could and should be based on the elements of the type of realistic perception in the awareness of believers which could be a prerequisite for their total conversion in the future to the positions of materialism.

Progress in the area of socialist social relations and the satisfaction of the real needs of society, needs related to sociomoral values at that, are decisive in terms of emancipating people from prejudices and vestiges. The most important role in the education of the "rich person" (Marx), who has no need to turn to the supernatural, could and should be played by socialist culture, atheistic thinking and skillful and interested educational work. Let us recall Marx's wise words: "The educator himself must be educated." This makes extremely topical the task of upgrading professionalism and competence in the dissemination of atheism. There is no place here for people who are uninformed, insensitive and indifferent.

Today the periodical press is openly criticizing experts of religion. It is true that such criticism is not entirely free from whiplashing. However, it expresses the concern of the public on the subject of the still remaining dogmatic approach to the interpretation of the complex and multi-dimensional processes in contemporary life. Naturally, one must oppose any retreat from the essential conceptual Marxist-Leninist positions. However, in this connection we must not hide behind the authority of statements made by Marx, Engels and Lenin and fail to introduce in the criticism of religion our own positive

input or study the new, specific and unique circumstances. The formulation of such problems is too important to be sacrificed to ambitions, whoever may be entertaining them.

This makes even less justified talk on the possibility of the "collapse" of atheistic research and publications for reasons of some kind of "superior" considerations. The point is to disseminate the new style of thinking to the entire area of the study of religion and atheistic education, totally eliminating dogmatism, primitivism, reliance on administrative-bureaucratic style and all kinds of leftist inclinations, which lead to the appearance of atheistic sectarianism, not to mention violations of the law guaranteeing the necessary prerequisites for social and governmental life, mandatory for both believers and nonbelievers.

At the same time, equally valid to this day is Lunacharskiy's figurative statement: "Religion has a political sting." This is confirmed by the behavior of individual extremists, who crawl out of the woodworks under circumstances of democratization and glasnost and who, under the banner of religion, display a hostile attitude toward the ideological values of socialism, misleading the believers and offering them rocks instead of bread. Lenin's decree on the separation of the church from the state was and remains the guardian of the true freedom on conscience of the citizens and excludes violations of the interests of society and the state.

The party emphasizes the mandatory obligation of every party member actively to participate in the dissemination of a dialectical-materialistic outlook. Again and again we must think through and implement under contemporary conditions Lenin's basic concept: "Unity within this truly revolutionary struggle waged by the oppressed class for the creation of paradise on earth is more important to us than the unity of opinion of the proletariat concerning paradise in heaven" (vol 12, p 146). This concept is based on a profound scientific understanding of the mechanism shaping social consciousness, including its religious aspect, and the interconnection within it between the conceptual and socio-political aspects, as well as a general methodological and specific historical interpretation of the future of religion in our society and on a worldwide scale.

Naturally, there remains a contradiction between the growth of the social activeness of believers and the religious elements in their outlook: this contradiction can be solved in the historical future by increasing participation in labor, social and governmental life and the enhancement of the standards and the moral influence of the collective. In the course of restructuring, the active, the creative aspect of human activities is manifested with increased clarity. In the course of their daily practical affairs the Soviet people assume, and will assume totally, control over the destiny of the state, the production process and their social and natural environment and, therefore, their own destiny, organizing life as

they conceive it, on the basis of progressive science, true humanism and high morality standards. Our society is facing a long path of development which will be covered jointly by atheists and believers, dedicating their efforts to the implementation of the socialist ideals promoted through the entire history of mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

### Pages From the Life and Struggle

18020010n Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 124-125

[Review by L. Yagodovskiy, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Izbrannyye Stati i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches], by Josip Broz Tito. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 647 pp]

[Text] The publication of collections of works by leaders of communist and worker parties has become a good tradition in our country, enabling a wide circle of readers to become more closely acquainted with the historical development of one socialist country or another. Naturally, such publications are not substitutes for monographs and other analytical works. Their advantage, however, is that they enable us to plunge into the thick of events, to experience the atmosphere of the time and to trace the shaping and development of political thinking. All of this pertains to the one-volume collection of articles and speeches by Josip Broz Tito covering the 1941-1979 period, which came out in 1987.

To Yugoslavia, this period was tempestuous and filled with sharp turns. The country was occupied by Hitlerite Germany and its satellites in April 1941. These events are discussed in chronological order in the collection, starting with the reports submitted to the Comintern on the situation in Yugoslavia. The report provides a profound analysis of the situation which developed as a result of the collapse of the bourgeois-monarchic system. It indicates the change which took place in the feelings of the people and earmarks the prospects for the development of the struggle against the aggressors under the leadership of the communist party. The work ends with materials dealing with the situation in October 1979. This was a speech delivered at the Kosovo Autonomous Region. It discusses successes and problems in solving the national problem in the country and the tasks of the League of Yugoslav Communists in this area.

The period between these two dates is filled with events of historical significance: the heroic struggle waged by the peoples of Yugoslavia against the fascist aggressors and their accomplices, the victory of the socialist revolution, the building of a new society and the strengthening of Yugoslavia's international positions.

The materials in the collection are divided into six sections, by topic: V.I. Lenin and the Great October Revolution; the people's liberation struggle and the building of socialism; friendship with the USSR; problems of international cooperation; activities of the League of Communists; and strengthening the unity among the peoples of Yugoslavia. In some cases the inclusion of a given material in a specific section may seem somewhat arbitrary. As a whole, however, such a structure has its advantages, for it facilitates an understanding of the development of the views of Tito and the LYC in each one of these areas.

The materials in this collection prove that the Yugoslav communists relied and continue to rely in their activities on Leninism as the inexhaustible treasury of revolutionary thinking. It is important to emphasize that they have invariably relied essentially on the need for a Leninist approach to solving problems of theory and practical policy. The position assumed by the LYC on this problem is thoroughly described in Tito's statements on the occasion of awarding him the Order of Lenin in 1972: "The vitality and inexhaustible power of the Leninist doctrine stem, above all, from its creative dialectical method. Lenin brilliantly predicted the need to enrich socialist thinking and practice with new knowledge and revolutionary experience. The Leninist approach implies a profound scientific analysis of reality and, at the same time, the implementation of the revolutionary changes for which the working class is struggling" (p 47).

We find throughout the collection repeated confirmations of the fact that the communist movement in Yugoslavia tried to be guided precisely by these principles. In the period of the struggle against fascism, the LYC assumed the difficult role of organizing the resistance. The communists spared no efforts or their lives in fighting in the partisan detachments and units of the people's liberation army. They were the nucleus of the established truly people's authorities and earned through their actions a high reputation among and the respect of the masses. During those years new forms of revolutionary movement were developed which, as Tito justifiably noted in 1946, "were determined by the new nature of the war and the new consequences of that war... and the nearly 30-year existence of the great socialist country, the Soviet Union, with its tremendous and comprehensive progress. Therefore," he concluded, "the specific nature of development and the results of this development in our country do not conflict with Marxism-Leninism; on the contrary, they are entirely consistent with that science" (pp 139-140).

Yugoslavia and its people's liberation army struggled against fascism shoulder to shoulder with the USSR and its Red Army. The significance of this alliance was fully realized in the country, as confirmed by Tito's repeated statements. "Our peoples," he said during a visit to Moscow in 1946, "know that without the help of the Soviet Union we would never have accomplished that

which we have today, i.e., a free, federal and independent republic of Yugoslavia, which now, as it develops its economic and political cooperation with the Soviet Union, is rapidly renovating itself" (p 131).

Indeed, profound changes developed in the country and "the foundations of a democracy of a new type" were laid. Essentially this meant establishing the prerequisites for building socialism. The equality among nations and national minorities in the country was asserted. Plants and factories and ground resources were nationalized; the situation of the working class and the peasantry changed radically and conditions for the comprehensive development of culture were secured. At that time Tito said that it was a question of creating a better and more just social system. "However, the way to achieving this objective neither should nor could be in all countries precisely the same as the path laid by the Great October Revolution" (p 155).

In the view of the Yugoslav leader, these ways could and do have a great deal of common features. However, the specific aspects of social development are determined by the specific conditions and nature of the internal development of each individual country.

The report presented at the 5th LYC Congress (July 1948) noted that Yugoslavia had secured the basic conditions for building socialism. The Western allies tried to hinder such a development of events but, as Tito said, "we were helped by the Soviet Union which threw its full support behind us" (p 157).

The materials in this work prove that by the end of the 1940s Yugoslavia, which had taken the path of building a socialist society, aspired to the development of fraternal relations with the USSR and with the people's democratic governments which had appeared in Central and Southeast Europe. This confirms, yet once again, the lack of objective foundations for the familiar conflict with Yugoslavia which took place in 1948-1949. "This clash," said the LYC Central Committee general secretary at a friendship meeting, which was held on 19 June 1956 at the Dinamo Stadium in Moscow, "was the result of erroneous isolated views on reciprocal relations among countries building socialism and the result of a malicious slander and distortions of what was taking place in Yugoslavia" (p 229). Several days earlier, Tito had noted that "remembering our mutual relations and joint struggle, our peoples joyfully welcomed the decision of the Soviet government to eliminate the abnormal and harmful situation in our relations, created in the recent past and, together with the Yugoslav government, undertake a search for laying foundations for a lengthy friendly cooperation between our two countries" (p 226).

The articles and speeches included in the collection bring to light specific aspects of building the new society in Yugoslavia where, as the report submitted at the 8th LYC Congress (December 1964) stipulated, the "system



of social self-government and direct socialist democracy" (p 165) has become the foundation of all development. This system is based on a principle according to which "the direct producers must be the main support of the expanded reproduction system" (p 167) and "gradually social affairs must be delegated to the representative authorities and the self-governing agencies with a view to allowing them to make decisions based on democratic procedures" (p 170).

In the period of building socialism in Yugoslavia, the "practice of achieving self-governing agreements and social contracts was established as a form of democratic coordination of different interests and of making joint and equitable decisions" (p 184). Unquestionably, experience in this area, acquired by the Yugoslav communists over the decades, is of great interest.

Tito's articles and speeches dealing with the internal development of the country enable us to understand the sources of many difficulties encountered in recent times by Yugoslav society. This applies, for example, to problems of the ideological struggle and manifestations of nationalism (including those in the Kosovo Autonomous Region), the problem of strengthening unity within the ranks of the League of Communists, the existence of bureaucratic trends and some negative phenomena in social life (including certain aspects of growing social stratification). In short, the materials included in the book offer a realistic picture of the country's development through the end of the 1970s. Their study will help us better to understand, in their totality, the processes which are occurring in today's Yugoslavia.

In the area of international relations, Yugoslavia's "long-term orientation," as Tito has repeatedly emphasized, is the policy of nonalignment. In explaining its nature, he said that "it offers us the broadest possible opportunities for making our major contribution to the struggle for peace, equality and progress throughout the world" (p 279).

It is impossible in a brief review to cover all the topics raised in the collection, the materials of which enable the readers interested in contemporary problems of socialism to gain a more complete idea of the experience of the League of Yugoslav Communists in the revolutionary struggle and in the building of a socialist society.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

#### **Pressure From the Right**

18020010o Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4,  
Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) pp 126-127

[Review by A. Galkin, professor and doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Pravyy Ekstremizm i Vneshnyaya Politika SSHA" [Right-Wing Extremism and Foreign Policy in the United States] by S.M. Plekhanov. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1986, 264 pp]

[Text] An increasing number of symptoms are appearing in world politics indicating that the period of increased tension, which began in the second half of the 1970s, is fading out. We see real progress on the difficult path toward a nuclear-free world and the creation of a comprehensive system of international security. It is no secret, however, that such positive changes are triggering the active counteraction on the part of right-wing circles in the Western countries, the United States above all, which are trying to hinder further steps toward strengthening peace and developing good neighborly cooperation.

We know that debates conducted by U.S. Senate committees on the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles is encountering certain difficulties. The opponents of detente and cooperation are obstructing changes for the better in the international situation, demanding of the leadership in Washington not to go too far and to halt the disarmament process.

Such has repeatedly been the case in the past as well. Invariably any change for the better in the international situation and in Soviet-American relations has been followed on the other side of the Atlantic by fierce counterattacks from the right, most of which, unfortunately, have yielded results. This circumstance makes it necessary soberly to take into consideration and assess the real weight carried by the extreme conservative forces in the United States and their possibilities and degree of influence on foreign policy decisions made by official Washington. The book under review is a contribution to the study of such problems. It is the first work in the area of Soviet-American studies to provide a comprehensive survey of the role which reactionary circles have played in defining Washington's foreign policy course since World War II.

McCarthyism, an influential extreme-reactionary trend, appeared in American political life by the turn of the 1950s. Republican Senator Joseph McCarthy, who advanced quickly in the atmosphere of the cold war, skillfully juggled features of petit-bourgeois mass awareness in the United States, such as the feeling of being the chosen, intolerance of other views and systems, a black-and-white vision of the world, and the aspiration to impose upon all mankind the system of American values and social order. The activities in which McCarthy and his supporters engaged were of great importance in influencing an overall shift to the right which took place in the United States at the beginning of the 1950s. Many of the concepts formulated by the extreme right in foreign policy were reflected in the official course, the foundations of which were laid by then secretaries of state Acheson and Dulles. The official recognition of anticommunism as the spiritual foundation of the U.S. postwar foreign policy course and its intensive ideologizing gave the extremists additional incentive to "hunt" those who, to a certain extent, perhaps, deemed necessary to take the realities of world politics into consideration.

However, at that point the extremists went too far. They entered an area of government governed by other, incomparably more powerful, circles. McCarthyism, as S.M. Plekhanov notes, increasingly appeared to the ruling U.S. elite as a force out of control, which was destabilizing American society (p 73). It clashed increasingly with the realities of the international position of the United States. The loss of atomic monopoly by the United States turned the option of unleashing an aggressive war against the Soviet Union into a clear danger to Washington. Changes in Soviet politics, which began in 1953, opened new opportunities for lowering international tension. The first cracks appeared in the ice of the cold war. Under these circumstances, McCarthy's political collapse was inevitable. However, by no means did the extreme right movement leave the stage.

Starting with the mid-1950s, conservative extremism in the United States has gone through various stages, with ups and downs. The nature of its influence on the foreign policy of the various administrations—democratic or republican—has remained the same, oriented above all toward increasing tension in relations between the USSR and the United States, encouraging the expansionistic trend in American foreign policy and discrediting the supporters of a realistic course. The latest and most energetic effort made by the right-wing extremists to become the decisive force in shaping the foreign policy course of the United States was launched between the second half of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s. Its purpose was to turn back the process of improving relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. This pressure influenced U.S. foreign policy as early as during the Carter administration. After Reagan's victory in the 1980 presidential elections the influence of these forces on U.S. foreign policy attained a particularly significant scale.

S.M. Plekhanov's book contributes to the better interpretation of the reasons for the paradox currently noted in Soviet-American relations, in which an administration, shaped under the stronger and more direct influence of the extreme right than any other Washington administration in the postwar period, nonetheless acts in a number of essential aspects of Soviet-American relations in opposition to the initial premises of reactionary extremism. The author convincingly proves that contemporary right-wing extremism was the product of the crisis in cold war policy and that the efforts of the right to enhance this policy invariably proved inefficient and, to a certain extent, prepared the grounds for the subsequent strengthening of a trend in U.S. social circles, favoring detente.

The author unravels the "genetic code" of contemporary right-wing extremism in the United States, identifying the specific contradictory combination of social interests and political trends in American society, the interaction between which periodically leads to sharp turns to the right in American foreign policy. In this combination the uncontrollable claims of the leadership of the U.S.

monopoly circles toward the creation of a world order subordinate to their interests play a determining role. The tremendous inertial force of these claims and their basic inaccessibility and the doomed nature of the idea of "Pax Americana" appear as the main contradiction which creates grounds for such drastic fluctuations in Washington's policies. Another contradiction is the struggle for power among the different groups of the ruling elite in the United States, and the objective contradictions between the interests of the multinational monopoly leadership and bourgeois groups (described by the author as "nationalistic") which are much less interested in foreign economic expansion.

Another characteristic circumstance noted by the author is the essential incompatibility between cold war and democracy. Although defined by its makers as a means of protecting Western democracy from the "communist threat," in fact the cold war itself proved to be the source of powerful antidemocratic trends in the United States. Militant anti-communism, turned into an official credo, quite soon became a pretext for the unification and mobilization of a variety of reactionary trends within the United States and their mounting of an offensive on democratic rights and freedoms and freedom of thought, and the social gains of the working people. The extreme right is trying to obstruct the path laid by the logic of historical development. It is unable to restrain it, however. History can be stopped only by blowing up our entire world. The imperative of survival in this increasingly brittle and interdependent world imposes the strictest possible limits to the possibilities of extremism.

Another idea which imbues this trip into the history of Soviet-American relations is the following: whenever reactionary extremists in the United States have mounted their latest attack on the existing system of international relations, they have made skillful and refined use of our foreign policy errors and inept steps and inability convincingly to substantiate our actions, as well as the real problems and difficulties of our internal development, for their own purposes. This is very important to remember and to take into consideration precisely now, in the face of the positive changes in Soviet-American relations and in the anticipation of the future attacks which the extreme right will mount against them.

S.M. Plekhanov's book is a profound and topical study which sheds a light on a number of important laws of contemporary American policy. The only regrettable feature is that the author stops with the events at the beginning of the 1980s. This, unquestionably, is a topic to be pursued further.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Chronicle. Meetings With the Editors**  
*18020010p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4,  
Mar 88 (signed to press 23 Feb 88) p 128*

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty cooperation, a delegation of KYLLOCHZHA, journal of the Korean Labor Party Central Committee, headed by deputy editor in chief Lee Chong-nam, visited the Soviet Union. Roundtable meetings between KOMMUNIST and KYLLOCHZHA on problems of peace and security in the Asian-Pacific area and on the unification of Korea were held on 10-11 February in Moscow. The meetings with the Korean comrades were attended by scientists from the Oriental Studies, Far East, and Economics of the World Socialist System Institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and members of the Soviet Committee For Solidarity with Asian and African Countries and the Soviet Peace Committee.

In addition to extensive discussions held in the editorial premises of KOMMUNIST on problems of work and cooperation between the two journals, the guests from the Korean People's Democratic Republic held talks at the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East and Oriental Studies Institutes.

In the course of their visit to the Belorussian SSR, the Korean journalists visited the Minsk Tractor Plant and the fine-cloth production association; they met with representatives of the mass information media in the republic and visited historical-revolutionary sites. They had a talk at the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department.

The journal's delegation was also received at the CPSU Central Committee Department.

H. Winter and G. Kaleks, members of the editorial collegium of EINHEIT, journal of the theory and practice of scientific socialism of the SED Central Committee, visited the Soviet Union in accordance with the plan for cooperation between the journals KOMMUNIST and EINHEIT. The visitors from the GDR held meetings at the U.S. and Canada Institute and the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System of the USSR Academy of Sciences. During their stay in the Latvian SSR they visited the Latbytkhim Production Association and held a talk with the editors of the journal KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII. The delegation also visited the economic department of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

The editors were visited by guests from Yugoslavia: L. Trvulovic, director of the Institute of International Politics and Economics, and B. Frangesh, member of the council of the Center for Strategic Studies. The guests inquired about the course of perestroyka in economic and other areas of social life. The talk also included problems of upgrading the role of the party press under the new conditions.

A meeting was held between KOMMUNIST editors and the collective of the Design Bureau imeni A.N. Tupolev, at which problems of preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, the development of intraparty democracy, the implementation of the economic reform, and the journal's coverage of problems of domestic history were discussed. A number of remarks and suggestions were expressed to the editors.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Publication Data**

*18020010q Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4,  
Mar 88*

English Title: KOMMUNIST, No 4, March 1988

Russian title: KOMMUNIST, 4 (1320), Mart 1988

Editors: N.B. Bikkenin (editor-in-chief), A.I. Antipov, E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, K.N. Brutents, I.A. Dedkov, V.I. Kadulin, S.V. Kolesnikov, O.R. Latsis, Yu.L. Molchanov, Ye.Z. Razumov, V.F. Rubtsov, N.N. Sibiryakov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, S.F. Yarmolyuk.

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: March 1988

Signed to Press: 23 February 1988

Copies: 1,025,000

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

END



**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

23 May 1988